DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 068 868 CG 007 575

AUTHOR	Ellis, Frederick E.
TITLE	The Dichotomy Between the Actual and the Perceived Role of the Elementary Guidance Counselor in the State of Massachusetts.
PUB DATE	Mar 72
NOTE	185p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Counseling Effectiveness; *Counselor Attitudes; Counselor Functions; Counselor Performance; *Counselor Role; *Elementary School Counseling; *Elementary School Counselors; *Elementary School Guidance; Elementary Schools; Guidance
IDENTIFIERS	Massachusetts

ABSTRACT

The views of the role of the elementary school counselor was studied in the state of Massachusetts. Three hundred and forty-three elementary school counselors, guidance directors, elementary school principals, superintendents and counselor educators were randomly selected to take part in the survey. Responses to a 3-part questionnaire were analyzed and compared by means of several statistical techniques. A number of results are presented. The investigation supported the hypothesis that there is a dichotomy between the perceived and actual roles of the elementary counselor as seen by counselors, administrators and counselor educators. The study revealed that all groups presently stress the remedial functions of the counselor although they recognize developmental guidance as an ideal goal. It was also emphasized that unless elementary counselors become actively involved in defining their role and making that definition known to others, elementary counseling will continue to be of decreasing importance. (Several pages may be light.) (Author/BW)

THE DICHOTOMY BETWEEN THE ACTUAL AND THE PERCEIVED ROLE OF THE ELEMENTARY GUIDANCE COUNSELOR IN THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS

A Dissertation Presented

by

Frederick E. Ellis

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Alvin E. Winder

Alvin F. Winder, Ph. D.
Advisor

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

CG 007 575

Submitted to Walden University
in partial fulfullment of the
requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

March, 1972

(c) Frederick E. Ellis -- 1972

All Rights Reserved

This dissertation is dedicated to my
loving wife Helen for her patience with
my frustrations and emotional upsets,
encouragement to overcome difficult
barriers and setbacks and assistance
to ensure the completion of my study.
In gratitude for the past, the present
and the future.

Acknowledgements

To my advisor, Dr. Alvin Winder, go many thanks for all of his advice, assistance and stimulation throughout the progress of this dissertation;

To Dr. Gordon Sutton for his advice in determining the best method of research sampling techniques for my study;

To Dr. Allen Kaynor, a member of my review committee, for his perception, willingness and assistance;

To Dr. Ann Marie Haase and Mr. Richard Stone for advice about the statistical methods used in my study;

And to the following people, without whose clerical assistance completion of this paper would not have been possible: Leo and Margie Vigneault, Mark and Helen Ellis, Roxanne Campbell and especially Jane Provost, for typing the final copy.

Abstract of the Dissertation

THE DICHOTOMY BETWEEN THE ACTUAL AND THE PERCEIVED ROLE OF THE ELEMENTARY GUIDANCE COUNSELOR IN THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS

by

Frederick E. Ellis

Directed by Dr. Alvin Winder

With the nationwide concern for accountability in education, the elementary school counselor is often the center of controversy. What is the role of the elementary counselor? How does he define his role and how do his administrators define it? Is there a difference between his view of his actual functions and those he feels he should perform and does his view differ from that of administrators and counselor educators? How relevant are current educational and certification requirements? An approach to answering these questions is to survey the groups involved to discover their attitudes toward and views of the elementary guidance counselor's role.

Methodology. A study of views of the elementary counselor's role was undertaken in the state of Massachusetts.

Three hundred and forty-three (343) elementary school counselors, guidance directors, elementary school principals, superintendents and counselor educators were randomly selected to take part in the survey. A 3-part questionnaire, employing Likert-type scales, Semantic Differential scales and open-ended questions, and dealing with various role functions, education, certification and counselor image, was sent to the total sample. Groups' responses were analyzed and compared by means of the Mann-Whitney U Test, the Friedman Two-Way Analysis of Variance, the F test of variance, the arithmetic mean and the standard deviation.

Results and Discussion. Significant differences were found both between and within all five groups in their views of the actual counselor role functions and the ideal functions. There was also much disagreement on certification and education requirements. There was no significant difference in their opinions of the counselor role image, however, nor of their rank ordering of groups serviced by the counselor. Counselor educators were found to be most at variance with the counselors' views in all areas of the questionnaire while directors and counselors most frequently agreed. The investigation supported the hypothesis that there is a dichotomy between the perceived and actual roles of the elementary counselor as seen by counselors, administrators and counselor educators and provides evidence that the

present controversy about the elementary guidance counselor's role is prompted by a failure to agree on and thus define the elementary counselor's role functions, inadequate educational preparation and irrelevant certification laws.

Implications. The study revealed that all groups presently stress the remedial functions of the counselor although they recognize developmental guidance as an ideal goal. Essentially, however, the actual roles were not seen as very different from the ideal. One need is for counselor educators to work more closely with the schools and to gain a more realistic view of the problems of the counselor. Counselors also need to work together through a state-wide elementary counselor organization to effect changes in elementary counselor education and certification requirements. Unless elementary counselors become actively involved in defining their role and making that definition known to others, elementary counseling will continue to be of decreasing importance in the State instead of becoming a strong complement of education with the aim of enhancing the total well-being and growth of all children.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements v

Abstract of the Dissertation vi

List of Tables xi

Chapter I, Introduction. 1

  History 1

  Philosophy. 14

  Goals 16

  Definitions 19

  Scope and Limitations 21

Chapter II, Related Research 23

Chapter III, Procedures and Methods of Research. 37

  Significance and Assumptions of Study 37

  Research Sample 40

  Nature of Research Instruments. 44

  Pretests. 49

  Mailing Procedures. 50

  Statistical Application for Analysis of Data. 51

Chapter IV, Analysis of Data 58

  Returns 58

  Questionnaire, Part I 59

    Child, What is 59

    Parent, What is. 64

    Teacher, What is 67

Administration, What is 72

Agencies and Community, What is 76

Child, What Should be 80

Parent, What Should be. 86

Teacher, What Should be 90

Administration, What Should be. 94

Outside Agencies and Community, What Should be. 98

Counselor Responses: The Friedman. 101

Questionnaire, Part II 116

Likert -type Scale. 116

Open-Ended Questions. 123

Questionnaire, Part III 132

Open-Ended Questions. 136

Chapter V, Summary and Conclusions. 139

Review 139

Discussion 142

Recommendations. 148

Bibliography. 154

Appendix A. 162

Appendix B. 164

LIST OF TABLES

1:1 Means, Child - What is 60

1:2 Rank Order of Means, Child - What is 61

1:3 Mann-Whitney U Test, Child - What is 62

1:4 Means, Parent - What is. 64

1:5 Rank Order of Means, Parent - What is. 65

1:6 Mann-Whitney U Test, Parent - What is. 66

1:7 Means, Teacher - What is 68

1:8 Rank Order of Means, Teacher - What is 69

1:9 Mann-Whitney U Test, Teacher - What is 71

1:10 Means, Administration - What is. 72

1:11 Rank Order of Means, Administration - What is. . . . 74

1:12 Mann-Whitney U Test, Administration - What is. . . . 76

1:13 Means, Agencies and Community - What is. 77

1:14 Rank Order of Means, Agencies and Community - What is 78

1:15 Mann-Whitney U Test, Agencies and Community - What is 79

2:1 Means, Child - What Should be. 81

2:2 Rank Order of Means, Child - What Should be. 83

2:3 Mann-Whitney U Test, Child - What Should be. 85

2:4 Means, Parent - What Should be 87

2:5 Rank Order of Means, Parent - What Should be 88

2:6 Mann-Whitney U Test, Parent - What Should be 89

2:7 Means, Teacher - What Should be. 90

2:8 Rank Order of Means, Teacher - What Should be . . . 91
2:9 Mann-Whitney U Test, Teacher - What Should be . . . 93
2:10 Means, Administration - What Should be. 95
2:11 Rank Order of Means, Administration - What Should be . 96
2:12 Mann-Whitney U Test, Administration - What Should be . 97
2:13 Means, Agencies and Community - What Should be. . . 98
2:14 Rank Order of Means, Agencies and Community - What Should be. . . . 100
2:15 Mann-Whitney U Test, Agencies and Community - What Should be. . . . 100
3:1 Friedman Analysis of Variance - Counselors. 102
3:2 Friedman Analysis of Variance - Directors 104
3:3 Friedman Analysis of Variance - Counselor Educators. 105
3:4 Friedman Analysis of Variance - Principals. 107
3:5 Friedman Analysis of Variance - Superintendents . . 108
3:6 Friedman Analysis of Variance - Child 110
3:7 Friedman Analysis of Variance - Parent. 111
3:8 Friedman Analysis of Variance - Teacher 112
3:9 Friedman Analysis of Variance - Administration. . . 114
3:10 Friedman Analysis of Variance - Agencies and Community 115
4:1 Means, Education and Certification. 118
4:2 Mann-Whitney U Test, Education and Certification. . 122
4:3 Required Courses for Counselors 123
4:4 Counselor Certification 128
4:5 Means, Counselor Functions. 129

4:6 Rank Order of Means, Counselor Functions 130

4:7 Counselor Functions, Response Frequency. 131

5:1 Responses, Semantic Differential Scales. 132

5:2 Means, Semantic Differential Scales. 134

5:3 F Test of Variance, Semantic Differential Scales . . 135

6:1 Standard Deviation Table . . . .

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

History

Although most people identify elementary school guidance with the twentieth-century movements in education, it is, in fact, the most recent in a cumulative development of guidance, dating back in time probably to the prehistoric era when survival, education and guidance were concomitant. Anthropologists theorize that early parents and tribe elders offered both education and guidance to youth on an informal basis as the need arose. Priests and other religious leaders of the early civilizations did the teaching and guiding of both adults and children. Throughout history this inter-relationship between guidance and education continued to exist even before the evolution of either formal institutions of learning or mass education.

In every century both guidance and education were recognized and fostered by the thinkers of the time. "Prior to the Renaissance, such men as Quintilian Socrates and Aristotle might be included among those who provided and advocated guidance for youth."[1] One of the most influential men of all time, Plato, proposed in The Republic, that there be three divisions of people, based on natural talents: The gold, or rulers; the iron, or professional soldiers; and the earth, the largest class made up of the great body of workers. These three classes were not to be based on wealth or birth, but on ability. The "philosopher kings," the "golden" rulers, might be found in the homes of workers or of soldiers. If so, they would be taken from those homes and put with others like themselves where they could be educated and nurtured for their future intellectual leadership of the society. The most significant aspects of Plato's ideal state were the concern for fitting the individual to the task and the task to the individual and the recognition of the ability of girls to learn. Plato, in fact, advocated the same education and training for girls as that received by boys and argued that women should be equals with men in government. Moreover, Plato's concern for the recognition of gifted children -- a concern that spans more than two thousand years -- reveals that one of the major concerns of guidance today, the early recognition of talent, was a concern of educated men even in the years B.C. Such concern was not so much the result of interest in the individual as a political interest in the welfare of the entire state. Today, moreover, such political concern, as we shall see, still influences the philosophy of both guidance and education as a whole.

---

[1] Ruth Martinson and Harry Smallenburg, Guidance in Elementary Schools (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1958), p. 8.

From the time of Plato to the early sixteenth century, Plato's humanistic philosophy dominated education, and the concern was to adapt education to the individual bent and to the age of the pupils. With the advent of the Puritans both in Europe and the new settlement in America, however, education moved away from humanistic philosophy. The Puritan leaders were more concerned to stamp out whatever emblems of the devil they might find in their young than to develop the unique qualities of the individual. The guidance given to children was very restrictive, harsh and disciplinary with the aim of producing "solid" citizens and good Christians. John Locke, the great English philosopher, recognized these qualities in the contemporary education. In 1693 he wrote a letter to a friend advising him about educating his son. His antagonism to the English Puritan schools caused him to warn his friend not to send his son to such a school but to have him tutored privately, for, he said, "Each man's mind has some peculiarity as well as his face"[2] and must be allowed to develop freely. Education, he went on to say, must take into consideration the individuality of the child.

---

[2] John Locke, Some Thoughts Concerning Education (Cambridge: R. H. Quick, 1880), p. 216.

Perhaps the greatest early advocate of educational guidance was Jean Jacques Rousseau, who wrote in the eighteenth century that "man is too noble a being to be obliged to serve simply as an instrument for others, and should not be employed at what he is fit for, without also taking into account what is fit for him. . . ."[3] Rousseau's work had a tremendous impact on educational philosophy all over the world. Among the many responses to his writings was a new awareness that "no form of education could be regarded as satisfactory which did not take account of the nature of the child."[4] Thus Rousseau's ideas were the forecasters of a new world. With the advent of the steam engine and industrialization, man's ideas turned toward a concern for labor, the abilities of the individual, and ultimately to the worth of the individual, or, in other words, to the democratic ideal.

In the early part of the nineteenth century two educators were of major importance to the growth of guidance philosophy. The first of these was Johann Herbart.

---

[3] William Boyd, The History of Western Education (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1959), p. 287.

[4] Ibid., p. 301.

Herbart, who considered individuality the main concern of education, was one of the most significant educators of the period. He proposed that the ultimate aim of education is to make the child good and for that reason, "The worth of a man is measured by his will and not by his intellect."[5] The child, he felt, must be guided to will good, not evil, and to use his intellect, therefore, as a control of his will. Unlike the Puritans, Herbart did not advocate breaking the will but guiding the will to a desire for good. Although his philosophy has a religious base, it clearly relates to concepts of both education and guidance which recognize the need for developing the moral health of the child.

The second important educator of the early nineteenth century was Friedrich Froebel. Froebel started the kindergarten, now generally considered an essential year in the education of the young. Froebel felt that the teacher must be "content to follow nature passively, without prescription or dictation, directing growth, not forcing it."[6] His belief in the self-determination of the individual and his view of educators as guides are both integral to the concepts of modern guidance and education.

---

[5] Outlines of Education Doctrine, Trans. A.F. Lange (New York: 1901), p. 40.

[6] Boyd, p. 354.

As the nineteenth century continued, Europeans especially held on to Froebel's and Herbart's theories, but in America new educational theories were arising, influenced no doubt by the nature of the aggressive, rugged American who derived from a people who had given up their heritage to strike out for freedom on their own initiative and courage. An experimenter of that period was Granville Stanley Hall, who concluded that the only way to understand children and how they learn was to investigate their minds scientifically. With a large following of disciples to assist him in necessary research, Hall introduced a new method of studying children. Through questionnaires, Hall investigated such emotions as fear, love, anger, curiosity, hate and pity, and the relationship of these emotions to learning. Not only was this the first use of the questionnaire, so common in elementary guidance today, but it reinforced Rousseau's theories of the stages of development and their relationship to education, by revealing that relationships did, in fact, exist and influence learning processes.

The biggest breakthrough to modern education occurred in 1896 when John Dewey founded the Laboratory School at the University of Chicago. There Dewey introduced the "child-centered" school. His main conviction was that the contemporary school was not relevant to the industrial society. He felt that children have to be educated to live in the world of the present, which, for the child of his period was the industrial society. Since modern society is industrial, children, he said, must be offered manual training and given more choice of subjects. Dewey said that "The more a teacher is aware of the past experiences of students, of their hopes, desires, chief interests, the better will he understand the forces at work that need to be directed and utilized for the formation of reflective habits."[7] The stress that Dewey placed on manual training and his inherent recognition of the value of educational guidance led directly to increasing national recognition of the need for guidance, particularly vocational, if education were to play a major part in preparing children for adult work.

Frank Parsons, who might be called the father of modern educational guidance, noted in Boston the pressures placed upon both students and schools by the newly passed compulsory laws of education. Seeing that there were many people looking for jobs and that there were jobs but that frequently neither was suited to the other, Parsons established the Vocational Bureau of Boston, which attempted to find jobs for people and people for jobs. Also he published a book entitled Choosing a Vocation, probably the first book in the field of guidance. "In his posthumously published book he set forth the ideas, methods, and materials which have now become commonplace in guidance programs."[8] Published in the same year, 1908, was another important contribution to the beginning of guidance -- Clifford Beers' book, A Mind That Found Itself. Although the direct result of Beers' publication was the establishment of the National Committee of Mental Hygiene, its strong emphasis on counseling and therapy influenced the introduction of guidance into the high school and revealed aspects of guidance other than vocational as important to the process of learning.

---

[7] John Dewey, Dictionary of Education (New York: Philosophical Library, 1959), p. 135.

Another major tool of guidance, the testing program, found its origin in Binet's early crude test of intelligence originated in 1905 in response to a request for an instrument to measure student ability so that grade placement could be more accurate. During World War I a number of tests were developed because of the need to recognize quickly people with particular abilities both to enhance the war effort at home and to increase the efficiency of the military. The second World War also contributed a number of tests designed to measure interests and abilities. Between the two wars, however, the methodology of testing became increasingly sophisticated. For example, in the 1920's industry was busy developing and using tests to measure the aptitude of workers in order to ensure maximum productivity. The concern was not for the well-being of the individual but for the health of industry. That the individual profited, however, was quickly recognized by educators, whose concern was humanistic rather than economic. Thus during the 1920's and 1930's guidance increased rapidly in the schools, particularly the high schools, where teachers took on the tasks of guiding and testing the students.

---

[8] Donald G. Mortenson and Allen M. Schmuller, Guidance in Today's Schools (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1959), p. 31.

The period of the depression with its tremendous scarcity of work brought an ever-increasing concern for early guidance. The need for job-training and retraining was seen to be important not only to the adult but to the child. It was during the period of the '30's' that colleges and universities began to offer courses in guidance. By 1940, in fact, there were "more than 500 courses in guidance" during the summer sessions alone.[9] The importance of the guidance program to the schools and the need for specialists in guidance were increasingly recognized and the role of guidance counselor was rapidly becoming a vocation.

Another important influence on the conception of guidance in the schools was Carl Rogers. Mainly during the 1940's and 1950's Rogers moved the emphasis of guidance from the interview and directive approach to the non-directive or child-centered approach. Rogers' initial influence was mainly on the high school program because his techniques rely on the ability of the student to verbally express his concerns. At the elementary level, children generally do not have the verbal facility needed for the non-directive approach to counseling. Perhaps more important for elementary guidance was the method of E. G. Williamson, who developed and introduced the directive approach to counseling at about the same time that Rogers was developing his method. The polarity of the two techniques -- one authority centered, the other client centered -- resulted in a great amount of research by educators and psychologists concerning the counseling process. The research, needless to say, further facilitated the adoption of a clinical approach to guidance in the schools. Most research agreed that while Rogers' method did not work well with pre-secondary pupils, Williamson's was not a viable alternative because it was too directive -- too extreme. The controversy was left unresolved by the adoption at all levels of education of eclectic methods, which allow the counselor to utilize whatever aspects of formal methodology he feels apply to the nature of the individual and the problem.

---

[9] Robert L. Gibson and Robert E. Higgins, Techniques of Guidance: An Approach to Pupil Analysis (Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1966), p. 6.

As the American society became increasingly complex, so education too became more and more complex. With the expansion of the curriculum and the resulting wide variety of choices of subject, a need for academic counseling increased. The importance of such world events as Sputnik can not be underestimated in their impact on education and inevitably on guidance functions. The result was that the counselor's role became increasingly diversified and the need for a philosophical basis for guidance and more specialized training for counselors became apparent. The National Defense Education Act of 1958 lent federal support to school guidance and "stimulated an interest in guidance at the elementary level."[10] Sputnik certainly provided impetus for State action since world competition was at stake, but the response of education was to champion the role of the individual. Throughout the growth of both education and guidance, in fact, it can be seen that movements were originated by the society at large or by an element in society who had a vested interest to protect. The interest of industry, for example, was prompted by a concern to make money. The interest of government was to ensure the world leadership of its free democracy. It was the educators who brought the concerns of such establishments to the schools and redirected them to stress the value of the individual, not just as a member of society but as a human being whose happiness depended on right development through education and guidance.

---

[10] Hyrum M. Smith and Louise Omwake Eckerson, Guidance in Elementary Schools (Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Office, 1966), p. 1.

Members of the guidance profession were specifically active in this direction. For example, studies like that of Leonard Miller, "Guidance for the Under-achiever with Superior Ability," put the emphasis on the child and the need for early guidance. In 1962 the Joint ACES-ASCA Committee on the Elementary School Counselor issued a statement, part of which follows:

> We believe that guidance for all children is an essential component of the total educational experience in the elementary school . . . . We envision a "counselor" as a member of the staff of each elementary school. The "counselor" will have three major responsibilities: counseling, consultation, and coordination. He will counsel and consult with individual students and groups of students; with individual teachers and groups of teachers, and with individual parents and groups of parents. He will coordinate the resources of the school and community in meeting the needs of the individual pupil . . . .[11]

As a consequence, the National Defense Education Act was amended in 1964 to specifically include elementary school

---

[11] William H. VanHoose, et. al., The Elementary School Counselor (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1970), p. 1.

guidance. Since that time the growth of counseling in the elementary schools has increased at a phenomenal rate. In the state of Massachusetts, with the advent of funds from the NDEA Title I, elementary guidance counselors have replaced school adjustment counselors, who were under the jurisdiction of Youth Service Boards rather than the school. As a result, guidance in the schools "has developed as a virtually separate entity, connected to the State segment by only a very few cogs representing primarily legislation and funding. Indeed, the wheels of each school system, with few exceptions, turn independently of those of the other school systems and the bigger and better made the wheels of a community are, the faster and smoother they turn, making it more and more impossible for the less well made and less synchronized wheels of any other community to catch up and benefit from the forward motion."[12] In Massachusetts elementary guidance programs have been the major educational innovation of the 1960's and consequently the role of the counselor has become so broad so quickly that his role is increasingly difficult to define. Since elementary school counseling culminates centuries of educational advancement yet "hardly exists outside the North

---

[12] Gordon P. Liddle and Arthur M. Kroll, Pupil Services for Massachusetts Schools (Boston, Mass.: Advisory Council on Education, 1969), p. 46

American continent -- not even in countries that are democratic and have what they consider to be an efficient school system,"[13] it would seem that the time for definition is long overdue.

Philosophy

By briefly reviewing the history of guidance one can see that guidance and education have the same philosophical root and that the philosophy has grown out of the goals and interests of the society as a whole. The belief on which elementary guidance is based is that the pupil must be assisted to "become a perceptive individual, sensitive to why and how he functions. . . ."[14] It is based on the concept of the worth of each individual. Its goals are to assist the child to develop his maximum potential academically, psychologically, physically and socially; to help each child recognize and accept both his strengths and weaknesses in the most purposeful and meaningful ways. "Guidance in elementary schools is usually interpreted as a service to assist all children in making the maximum use of their abilities, for their own good and for that of society."[15]

---

[13] Hugh Lytton, School Counselling and Counsellor Education in the United States (Great Britain: St. Anne's Press, 1968), p. 29.

[14] Angelo V. Boy, "Educational and Counseling Goals," Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, III, 2 (Dec., 1968), p. 85.

The person in any society must be able to function successfully, economically, socially, and politically. In the modern complex society, he must have a complete understanding of himself and how to live in this rapid-paced, technologically-centered world. The vast amount of learning demanded for making wise choices and solving difficult problems has placed a heavy burden on both the school and the child. The school must impart to children who are ready, able and willing to accept it, the knowledge that the most important fact of education is that it is an ongoing process and that they must learn not only as much as they can but how to discover knowledge, where to find information and how to assimilate it. One of the most important functions of the elementary guidance counselor is to identify the children who are ready for such learning and have the ability to learn as well as to identify the less able and help to make them willing to learn to the extent of their capacities. The emphasis on guidance services is "on early identification of the pupil's intellectual, emotional, social and physical characteristics: development of his talents; diagnosis of his learning difficulties, if any; and early use of available resources to meet his needs."[16]

---

[15] Hyrum M. Smith and Louise Eckerson, Guidance for Children in Elementary Schools (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963), p. 1.

Guidance recognizes that every child is unique; that every child lives in a unique environment and that the goal of education is to develop the potentiality of the whole child, not just his intellectual or academic potential. Guidance seeks to bring each child to the fullest expression of himself; thus it seeks to aid in the creation of total personalities. It strives to "reveal and release the native powers of the individual; education trains and adjusts those same powers."[17]

Goals

Some educators see guidance as having two kinds of goals: immediate and ultimate.[18] Immediate are those which require the attention of the counselor within a short period of time, for example intervention in a classroom for a discipline or academic problem which needs immediate attention. Or the counselor might be asked to assist the student, parent, teacher or other school personnel in solving a problem. Also immediate is to place the child within a grade or level either because of a referral, or test evaluation. These and others like them have as their immediate goal the maintenance of maximum efficiency and harmony within the school and/or the individual involved, whether that individual is a child, parent or teacher. Ultimate goals refer to the development of a total awareness within the child, helping him to adjust to society and his environment by understanding himself and others. In order to achieve such goals, it must be recognized that one of the major responsibilities of guidance is to educate parents. Parents need to see their child realistically. The counselor can help by interpreting test results, by showing parents what the results mean and how their child compares with local, state and national norms. Such understanding is necessary if they are to recognize the reasons for school actions in relation to their child and if they are to cooperate with the schools in working for the best for their child.

---

[16] Ibid.

[17] Reed Fulton, "Questions in Our Minds About Guidance," The Clearing House, XXVIII, 7 (March, 1954), 394.

[18] Robert A. Apostal, "Objectives of Elementary Guidance," The School Counselor, X, 1 (Oct., 1962), 23.

Other educators conceive of three kinds of goals; developmental, preventive and remedial.[19] Developmental guidance is directed toward all students within the school, whether they have problems or not. Its aim is to help them make better choices and decisions and to live a better, fuller life. Preventive guidance works with those students who appear to have a developing problem which is not manifested fully but is beginning to be revealed in their home and school behavior. Remedial guidance, on the other hand, seeks to overcome problems which seriously hamper a child's activities, particularly within the school setting.

---

[19] Kenneth D. Hoyt, "Some Thoughts on Elementary Guidance," Guidance and Counseling in the Elementary Schools, ed. Donald Dinkmeyer (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963), p. 33.

No matter what terms one uses to describe the goals of elementary school guidance, no matter what approach or combination of approaches one uses to achieve them, perhaps the ultimate goals are to foster respect for and knowledge of oneself and others, a sense of personal responsibility and an attempt to function successfully at the maximum of one's level of ability. Probably the best statement of the goals of elementary school guidance was formulated at the White House Conference on Education in 1955. The following goals were designated as "appropriate goals of education"; however, it is a measure of the interrelationship between guidance and education that these goals state succinctly exactly the aims of guidance:

> a) respect and appreciation for human values and the beliefs of others,

b) ability to think and evaluate constructively
c) effective work habits and self-discipline
d) ethical behavior based on a sense of moral and spiritual values
e) physical and mental health[20]

Definitions

One reads and hears extensive discussion among people concerned with elementary guidance about such questions as "What is the role of the elementary counselor?" The experience of all people in guidance has been that the role of the counselor does not lend itself to definition very readily. Even the attempt to answer the question of counselor role in terms of those activities a counselor should engage in, results in wide disagreement. Perhaps an approach to defining guidance can be made by examining what guidance seeks to accomplish. Smith and Eckerson have proposed that "Guidance in the elementary schools assists all children directly and indirectly through their teachers and parents, in making maximum use of their abilities for their own development and for the good of society. The emphasis is on the recognition of intellectual, emotional, social and physical strengths and weaknesses, on the developing of talents, on the prevention of conditions which interfere with learning and on early use of available resources to meet the needs of children."[21] If it can be agreed that guidance is essentially what Eckerson and Smith state, then perhaps one might define the role of the guidance worker as involving the process of working with parents, teachers, school administration, the community and agencies within the community and finally and most importantly the child, in order to assure that every child achieves maximum adjustment, educationally, psychologically, physically and socially so that he may be a happy, productive adult who enhances the society in which he lives. Elementary school guidance, as one part of the total guidance program, would then assure the early development of the child, thus facilitating his entrance into secondary school and ultimately the total society.

---

[20] Boy, p. 85.

In terms of this definition of elementary guidance counseling, the problems which the counselor encounters are:

1) Does his role as guidance counselor include all these functions?
2) What are the priorities among those functions?
3) Who is responsible for determining both his functions and the priorities among them?
4) What educational preparation does he need in order to perform those functions required of him?

---

[21] "Elementary School Guidance: The Consultant," Guidance and Counseling in the Elementary School, ed. Donald Dinkmeyer (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1963), p. 113.

These problems offer a great leeway in interpretation of their importance and priority in the role of the guidance counselor. Because of the abstract nature of these problems, this leeway can result in a substantial difference between the perceived role of the counselor and his actual role.

In this study the term "actual role" refers to the functions which counselors perform in their day-to-day operation within the school. "Perceived role" denotes those functions which are assigned theoretically to the elementary school counselor, based on the definition and goals of the counseling program, what might then be referred to as the "ideal" function.

Scope and Limitations of Study

The study was limited to an examination of the role of the elementary guidance counselor in the state of Massachusetts. One hundred and twenty towns and cities in the State have elementary school guidance counselors. The total number of counselors at the elementary level in the State totals 359. One-third of these counselors (113) were surveyed after being randomly selected. They represented sixty school districts. Supervisors of guidance programs, usually guidance directors or directors of pupil personnel services, existed in all 120 districts. Fifty percent of these were randomly selected. In these 120 districts there is a total of 1098 elementary school principals. This total was divided by eleven and 99 were randomly chosen for the survey. In the 120 districts there is a total of 119 superintendents; 59 of these (50%) were surveyed. All of the 120 districts having elementary guidance counselors are represented by some part of the research sample. The final group participating in the survey was made up of 12 counselor educators, the director of each of the Counselor Education Programs at the 12 universities and colleges in the State which offer a Counselor Education Program. All persons participating in the study were administered the same group of questionnaires. In addition to the questionnaires, however, the counselor educators were asked to respond to questions about the nature of the counselor education program at their institution.

CHAPTER II

RELATED RESEARCH

"Over the past decade a great deal of theorizing about distinctive features of elementary school guidance has been offered."[22] A major step in defining the actual role of the elementary school counselor would be taken if educational theorists could agree on the nature of elementary school counseling as a discipline. There are those who believe that "a well-prepared counselor who is confident of his professional status should build his own role" and that a good elementary school guidance counselor should have a "loosely defined role"[23] that would be determined by the school philosophy, environment and population factors, rather than "a complex of graduate preparation, certification standards, undeviating functions and techniques and a nine-to-three office schedule."[24] On the other hand, other theorists contend that "the elementary school counselor lacks a definitive statement which could guide his actions"[25] and consequently counselors find themselves pressured into functioning as "psychometrists, school psychologists, visiting teachers, or special education specialists" and when "these personnel are already on the job, there is often some difficulty in communicating just what the counselor's role shall be."[26] In fact, one writer contends that improving the effectiveness of counselors will be difficult to achieve "because counselors are burdened with tasks they should not be performing."[27] A study of the difference between the ideal role and the actual role of the guidance counselor compared the perception of school principals in the state of Utah with that of counselor educators, the counselor educators' view being considered as the ideal. All of the secondary school principals in the State were surveyed and 93% responded. Six counselor educators from six different geographical areas of the United States were asked to respond to the same Counselor Role Questionnaire as answered by the principals. Among the six counselor educators there was perfect agreement as to the proper functions of counselors. Among the principals there were differences depending primarily on the number of guidance courses which they themselves had taken. In general, however, principals tended to expect non-counseling activities, such as clerical duties, of counselors. Principals saw counselors as "Assuming many varied roles, filling in as an all-around assistant -- whether it be for clerical work, monitoring, teaching or counseling."[28] Moreover, principals tended to feel that counselors should share information with them and other school personnel while counselor educators held confidentiality of major importance. Both groups generally agreed that counselors should not be involved in discipline. Their views on all other questions substantiate the point that there is wide difference, not only between the perceived and actual roles of counselors, but between the actual and ideal roles. This study as well as the controversy between the advocates of rigidly defined roles and those of loosely defined roles for elementary school guidance counselors point to a need for study of the problems, clarification of the needs, and proposals for resolution and correction.

---

[22] Wallace Phillips, "The Professionalization of Elementary School Counselors," Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, IV, 2 (Dec., 1969), 83.

[23] Louise O. Eckerson, "In Support of a Loosely Defined Role for the Elementary School Counselor," Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, IV, 2 (Dec., 1969), 85.

[24] Ibid., p. 32.

---

[25] Henry Kaczkowski, "The Elementary School Counselor as Consultant," Guidance and Counseling in the Elementary School (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Ind., 1963), p. 128.

[26] Phillips, p. 90.

[27] Jon Carlson and John J. Peitrofesa, "A Trilevel Guidance Structure: An Answer to Our Apparent Ineffectiveness," Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, V, 3 (March, 1971), 191.

---

[28] Darrell H. Hart and Donald J. Prince, "Role Conflict for School Counselors: Training Versus Job Demands," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLVIII, 5 (Jan., 1970), 374.

One of the most controversial areas is the philosophy of guidance itself. Among educators there seem to be three concepts of guidance: preventive, remedial and developmental. Moreover, within each of these three concepts there appear to be two possible approaches: the cognitive and the "whole child" approach. For example, Verne Faust claims that "while we frequently have heard it said that it is the 'whole child' we are concerned with in education, more often it is cognition alone which in reality receives attention of teachers, counselors and the public."[29] He goes on to add that "every segment of the elementary school counselor education program has been designed to prepare the counselor to contribute toward the child's functioning maximally at the cognitive level. . . ."[30] Faust feels so strongly that this perception of the elementary guidance counselor's function is incorrect that he states that those who also disagree with such a goal for guidance must "work cautiously in new directions. . . . resign our positions"[31] or somehow effect change.

---

[29] "Elementary School Counseling," Guidance and Counseling in the Elementary Schools, p. 28.

[30] Ibid., p. 31.

In a study of counselors as perceived by elementary principals, the researchers discovered that "many elementary school principals are unsure of elementary school counseling's purpose and possibilities."[32] When asked to rank various functions according to importance, they tended to rank in the following order: 1) counseling individual students with personal problems, 2) consulting with parents, 3) counseling students with academic problems, 4) counseling students with severe discipline problems, 5) identifying students with special talents and problems, 6) assisting teachers in testing, and a list of eleven more functions mainly pertaining to testing, curriculum and guidance relations with the school and community.[33] It is interesting to note that all of the six functions heading the list relate directly to remedial guidance. Yet 79% of the principals responding indicated that they felt elementary guidance emphasizes prevention more than does secondary guidance.[34]

---

[31] Ibid., p. 28.

[32] Phillips, p. 90.

[33] William P. McDougall and Henry M. Reitan, "The Elementary Counselor as Perceived by Elementary Principals," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLII, 4 (Dec., 1963), 348-353.

[34] Ibid., p. 354.

The State Department of Colorado in its Handbook suggests that the "elementary school counselor's role might be that of facilitators of objectives in the affective domain. These objectives include behaviors of students in the areas of interest, attitudes, and values, and the development of appreciations and adequate adjustment."[35] The Handbook emphasizes that the role of the counselor is to contribute "toward building learning climates" in order for the child to learn effectively, rather than treating "crises or preventing something."[36] In other words, it stresses developmental guidance. The Iowa Handbook begins: "A major objective of education in our society is to assist individuals in their total development. . . . Guidance activities are designed to help individuals examine themselves and society, make plans and decisions, and attain their maximum development."[37] In both, then, the stress is on developmental guidance.

Biasco, in a study of elementary guidance in New York state, however, found that few counselors support a developmental guidance program, the kind of program which he himself recommends. He further found that most of the schools never evaluated their guidance programs, had very poor facilities, lacked secretaries, kept poor records, and lacked "an adequate understanding of the basic principles of confidentiality."[38] He recommended, as the result of his study, that regularly scheduled planning sessions be held with the principals and a small, selective advisory committee made up primarily of teachers; frequent in-service training sessions; strong state support in helping counselors keep confidences; more private offices, and frequent self- and outside evaluations. In his study, he discovered that there were some commonalities among the various elementary school guidance programs. For example, he found that all of them involved "counseling of children; all involved conferencing with parents; all involved services to teachers. Most of the counselors were involved in the testing program in the school; most of them participated in the placement function of the school; most of them made home visits."[39] However, the emphasis was somewhat different in each program.

---

[35] J. Bradley Williams, Elementary Counseling and Guidance Handbook (Denver, Colorado: Dept. of Education, 1970), p. 21.

[36] Ibid.

[37] Elementary Guidance in Iowa: A Guide (Iowa: Department of Public Instruction, n.d.), p. 5.

---

[38] Frank Biasco, "Impressions of an Observer," Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, III, 4 (May, 1969), 245.

[39] Ibid., p. 243.

Hill, by visiting elementary schools in twenty-seven states in a period of eighteen months, found that there was widespread agreement of the purposes of a guidance program in the elementary school as well as agreement that there was much need for change and improvement in such programs.[40] Yet he feels that elementary guidance has serious handicaps: its newness; the "strong academic emphasis" which "places intellect first and, unfortunately, seems at times to have sought to isolate the child's mind from the rest of his being"; a skepticism among teachers, administrators and other school personnel regarding elementary school guidance; the "slowness with which well-defined programs for the presentation of elementary school counselors and guidance administrators have come into being in the universities," and others.[41] We see that among other problems, Hill laments the emphasis placed on cognitive learning.

The studies by Hill, Biasco, Phillips and McDougall, and Reitan all reveal not only a general disagreement about the counselor's role, but also a difference in perception of that role and even of the goals of elementary school guidance itself. While Hill and others blame the disagreements on the newness of the role and other causes arising out of the school situation, still other investigators trace the root of the problems to failures in counselor education.

---

[40] George E. Hill, "The Emerging Role of Guidance in the Elementary Schools," Proceedings of the New England Guidance Conferences, Nov., 1968, p. 99.

[41] Ibid., p. 103.

One researcher, making a study in 1969, found that counselor education in the Midwest had made great progress in the four years following 1965. She notes that in 1965 only 9% of the graduate institutions surveyed had differentiated programs for elementary school counselors while in 1969, 67% did. Of the 31 respondents to her questionnaire 26 indicated a special elementary counseling program different from the secondary school counselor programs. The most common courses among those schools with differentiated programs were in elementary school guidance, child growth and development and elementary counselor practicum or internship.[42] Another study in the same year found that the number of institutions offering a "distinctly different program" for elementary school counselors increased from 41 in 1967 to 77 in 1969.[43] Despite the growth of counselor education programs for elementary level counselors, some educators are concerned about the value of the programs, since most of them are an outgrowth of secondary counselor programs. For example, Hill, while recognizing the growth of doctoral level programs in elementary counseling, notes that "there is little evidence that they are producing enough leaders for counselor education and supervision of elementary school guidance."[44] In the same vein Moore and Haley state that "The natural trend towards unified reciprocal action between state departments of education in the granting of certification and licenses indicates a definite need for elementary school counselor-educators to provide adequate and relevant training for their counselor candidates."[45] The issue, however, seems to be, what is "relevant" training? Richard Dunlop in several different articles points out the need for a clearer definition of the counselor in order that the counselor education programs may be made more relevant. He asks if counselors are conceived of as educators, psychologists, or unique professionals. If they are educators, then the present emphasis on teacher training and the requirement of teaching experience is valid; if, on the other hand, they are psychologists, then the responsibility for training them should be in the hands of college psychology departments and teaching should be eliminated as a study. Finally, if they are to be considered unique professionals, then a unique department of counselor education should be created and a unique degree awarded. Dunlop suggests that master's and doctor's degrees of Professional Counseling might be the peoper designation for such degrees. Clearly in each of these three possible definitions, the emphasis would be quite different.[46] Only a true definition of the guidance counselor and an accurate statement of his functions and goals would lead to such specialized education, which would result in a marked change in graduate schools which prepare counselors and a marked change in the professional status of the counselor.

---

[42] L. Sue Pompian, "Elementary School Counselor Preparation in the Midwest," Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, IV, 2 (Dec., 1969), 83.

[43] Netzchke and Hill, "The Professionalization of the Elementary School Counselor ," Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, IV, 2 (Dec., 1969), 88.

---

[44] George Hill, "Doctoral Preparation in the Field of Elementary School Guidance," Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, IV, 3 (March, 1970), 201.

[45] John Moore and Margaret Haley, "Relevancy in the Training of Elementary School Counselors," Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, V, 4 (May, 1971), 308.

The present view of the counselor is that he is a counselor and educator. The state of Massachusetts, for example, makes the following requirements for the certification of guidance counselors (there is no differentiation between elementary or secondary counselors):

---

[46] Richard S. Dunlop, "The Counselor: Educator, Psychologist, or Something Unique?" Focus on Guidance, III, 9 (May, 1971), 1-8.

1) A bachelor's degree from an accredited institution, or a diploma from a four-year normal school approved by the Board of Education

2) A teacher's certificate valid for service in the school to be served by the counselor

3) Twelve semester hours of guidance program education distributed among all of the following:
    Principles and Practices of Guidance
    Counseling
    Tests and Measurements
    Occupational Information[47]

The requirement of a teacher's certificate is the rule, not the exception, in most states.

Another problem in State licensing of counselors is brought up by Eckerson. In 1967 she found that only 34 states had certification for counselors from grades K-12, and that "there is little or no differentiation in required courses for the different levels."[48] One year later Van Hoose and Vafakas made a study of state certification standards. They found that while 31 states have "developed and published standards pertaining to guidance in the elementary school, for the most part, these are vague and lack specificity in terms of objectives and producing desired changes in children."[49]

---

[47] The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Department of Education, Bureau of Teacher Certification and Placement, 1956 (latest ruling).

[48] Louise Eckerson, "Elementary School Guidance, Developments and Trends," Guidance Awareness in Elementary Education, George Moreau, ed. (Washington: National Catholic Assoc., 1967), p. 2.

Dunlop notes that the most widespread assumption about counselors is that they are school people, thus their major training is by professors who specialize in teacher training. Certification requirements reflect this assumption. Perhaps the second most widespread assumption is that a counselor is a counselor -- that there is no need for differentiating the requirements for counseling at the various school levels. Some people suggest that the only solution is to require examination for counselor certification, but certainly before examination would relieve the present problems in guidance, clarification of many aspects of guidance counseling is necessary. How are elementary guidance counselors different from secondary guidance counselors? What education should each have? What is the nature of the counselor's role at the different school levels? These questions at least must be answered before changes in counselor education and in counselor certification can be any more than gratuitous.

---

[49] William H. VanHoose and Catherine M. Vafakas, "Status of Guidance and Counseling in the Elementary School," *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*, XLVI, 6 (Feb., 1968), 533.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES AND METHODS OF RESEARCH

Significance and Assumptions of the Study

In May, 1970, Robert Isenberg, the new vice-president of the American School Counselors Association (ASCA) in charge of elementary counseling stated that he would like

> to see a survey revealing where elementary counselors are in the separate states, what they are doing, what they think they should be doing, and what education, training and experience is demanded of them by their duties. I feel this information is crucial if elementary counselors are to develop a worthwhile professional program with ASCA and give positive direction to legislators, counselor educators and professional education associations on how they can help us make our services more meaningful to students, teachers and parents.

One year later, May, 1971, Isenberg wrote that he "received word that elementary school counseling in Cincinnati, Ohio and Kent, Washington, to name but two states, is in jeopardy of being eliminated."[51] He stressed the problem of survival in counseling because of the "coming

---

[50] Robert L. Isenberg, "From Your Vice-President," Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, IV, 4 (May, 1970), 243.

[51] "Vice-President's Message," Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, V, 4 (May, 1971), 245.

age of accountability." Perhaps, as Barnes and McClure state, the most pressing problem, and the reason for failure, in elementary guidance is the need to define the role of the elementary counselor. This study proposes to do just that by analyzing perceived and actual roles of the elementary school counselor from four points of view:

1) the elementary school administration, specifically the superintendent of schools and the elementary school principal
2) the counseling administration, the director of pupil personnel services or director of guidance
3) the State and college requirements, Certification requirements and college educators' views of elementary school guidance functions as well as courses required for elementary counselor education
4) elementary school counselors themselves

This study compares these perceptions in order to discover areas of agreement and disagreement among them, the relevance and adequacy of elementary school counselor education and preparation, and needs for improvement in functions, education and training, and certification requirements. It is hypothesized that there is a significant

---

[52] Keith D. Barnes and Patricia McClure, "Elementary Guidance--A Critical Look From the Field," Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, IV, 2 (Dec., 1969), 104.

difference between the role of the elementary guidance counselor both as it is perceived by the Massachusetts State Department of Education, Massachusetts school administrators, counselor educators and employed elementary school counselors as opposed to how the role is actually performed. The hypotheses underlying this study are that:

1) elementary school administrators perceive the functions of the elementary school counselor incorrectly in terms of his actual performance of functions

2) the elementary counselor perceives his own role as different from what it actually is

3) counselor educators perceive elementary counselor functions as different from the actual counselor performance

4) administrators, counselors and counselor educators all view the ideal functions of an elementary counselor as different from his present functions

5) administrators, counselors and counselor educators disagree on education and certification requirements for elementary school counselors

6) despite disagreements on counselor functions, administrators, counselors and counselor educators view the elementary counselor's role favorably

The rationale for the study is:

1) that an awareness of the differences between perceived and actual roles of the elementary guidance counselor can lead to improved requirements for certification, more realistic preparation and more efficient functioning of the elementary guidance counselor

2) that such improvements will foster better education of elementary school children

3) that optimum functions of the guidance counselor at the elementary level could help prevent many of the social problems among contemporary youth, and that such social ramifications make the study not only significant but essential.

Research Sample

In order to analyze the dichotomy between the actual and the perceived role of the elementary guidance counselor in the state of Massachusetts, certain basic problems had to be resolved. The first of these was the nature of the group to be analyzed: exactly whose perceptions of the elementary counselor's role were to be involved in the study. Certainly the counselor's own view of his role and functions would be of prime importance; therefore the counselor would have to be included in the sample. Since the major issue of the study is how the counselor's role differs from the perception of it, it would seem that a second group of major importance would be those people responsible for the job description of the counselor: the administration or, specifically, the superintendent of schools, the elementary school principals and the supervisors of guidance. The supervisor of guidance, whether his title is Director of Guidance, Director of Pupil Personnel Services or some other such designation, is directly responsible for the functions of the counselor. It is he who oversees the counselor's work, who confers with the counselor on specific cases, who acts as liaison between the counselor and superintendent of schools and school committee. He also generally recommends appointment and reappointment. Specifically then he is accountable for the counselor's role. The principal, on the other hand, has complete responsibility for his building, all pupils, all personnel and all programs in that building. Therefore the counselor must work through his jurisdiction in order to carry out any roles with teachers, pupils or special programs. The superintendent, since he is responsible for the total school operation, is the final authority in anything relating to the counselor. What these three administrators see as the counselor's roles are then extremely important to his operation within the school.

The study to this point, then, included four groups, all from within the school itself. Inherent in the concern about the difference between the real and the perceived roles of the counselor is a concern for the counselor's preparation and training for his functions; thus a fifth group emerged: counselor educators. It was decided that these five groups constituted a large sample and would offer a meaningful view of the counselor-role.

Once the groups to be surveyed had been clarified, a second problem arose. Could the total population be handled? In view of the extremely large number of participants available in these five categories, close to 2000, it seemed more feasible to select a sample from each group. After consultation with Dr. Gordon Sutton, Professor of Sociology at the University of Massachusetts, and upon his recommendation, it was decided to use a modification of the stratified sample. "It is essential that the individuals selected be chosen in such a way that the small groups, or samples, approximate the larger group or population,"[53] in order for the inferential statistics to have validity. Thus a percentage of each of the first four groups was selected. The elementary guidance counselor sample was chosen by selecting every third name -- 33% -- starting with the eighth name (which was drawn from a lottery that included numbers one to ten) and going through the full range and back to the eighth name again.

All of the administration groups were chosen only from public schools that have elementary guidance counselors. Because of the comparatively small number of superintendents (119) and guidance supervisors (120), it was decided to survey 50% of these groups in order to ensure greater reliability and validity of the results. From the list of superintendents, every other one was chosen, beginning with number two, "even" having been selected from a lottery of "odd" and "even." The same selection procedure was used again to select the sample of guidance supervisors. "Even" was drawn for this group and every other one was then chosen for use in the sample. Finally, because of an extremely large population (1098), it was decided that 9% or 99 of the principals would be a sufficiently reliable sample and thus every eleventh principal was chosen, starting with eleven which was drawn from a lottery of one to eleven. It is interesting to note that when all samples had been selected, every school system in the State which has elementary guidance was represented in at least one category. Research revealed that there are only twelve colleges or universities in Massachusetts that have an elementary guidance counselor training program. Since there was such a small number, questionnaires were sent to the director of each of these programs. In addition to the questionnaire, counselor educators were asked to respond to three questions:

---

[53] John W. Best, Research in Education (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1959), p. 203.

1) Does your institution have a program of elementary counselor education?

2) If yes, what are the requirements for the completion of the program?

3) What degree is issued upon completion of the program?

Nature of Research Instruments

The third problem was to determine the nature of the instrument or instruments to be used. Three kinds of information were sought:

1) the degree of importance assigned to the various functions of the elementary guidance counselor in the public schools, both in reality and in an ideal program.
2) the amount and kind of education and training of the elementary guidance counselor and the certification requirements for his employment.
3) the attitudes of the various groups toward the elementary guidance counselor role.

It was clear that a single instrument could not validly elicit such a variety of response. Therefore, a three-part instrument was devised.

The Likert-type scale was selected for the first part of the questionnaire because it is an attitudinal scale in which "the subjects are asked to respond to each item in terms of several degrees of agreement or disagreement"[54] and could easily be adapted to drawing a response concerning both the real or actual and the ideal program, with the use of a single statement. Moreover, the Likert, unlike the Thurstone which requires the use of a panel of fifty or more judges, is easily usable. Osgood, Tannebaum and Suci suggest that the main criteria for measuring instruments are objectivity, reliability, validity, sensitivity, comparability, and utility.[55] The Likert rates high on all of these scales. In fact, "The coefficient of correlation between the scales [Thurstone and Likert] reported as high as + .92 in one study."[56]

---

[54] Marie Jahoda and Neil Warren, Attitudes (Baltimore, Maryland: Penguin Books, Inc., 1966), p. 214.

Part I on the questionnaire developed for this study was divided into five parts, one each dealing with the services of the elementary guidance counselor to the child, the parent, the teacher, the administration and to outside agencies and the community (See Appendix B for instrument). The specific items on the questionnaire were determined by both the ACES and the ASCA guidelines of 1966 for developing elementary guidance counselors, where the stress was on counseling, coordination and consultation, and on the recommendations of people in guidance. For instance, Dinkmeyer and Faust as well as many others stress the need for the elementary counselor to work with parents in the home. Dominick D. Pellegreno points out that "One of the major roles ascribed to the elementary school counselor is consulting with other educational team members" and "assisting teachers and students" and "enhancing students' learning skills by interpreting to the teachers the effects of the classroom learning climate on the children."[57] Furthermore, Moreau points out the need of elementary counselors to conduct group guidance, have career days, visit the high school, teach occupations and conduct group counseling sessions.[58] All of these ideas were included in the questionnaire under Part I.

---

[55] The Measurement of Meaning (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1971), p. 11.

[56] Ibid., p. 157.

The second part of the instrument dealt with education, training and certification of counselors. Again the Likert-type scale was used. However, only one five-point scale was used in conjunction with a series of 16 phrases. Part II concludes with three open-ended statements which required a written response from respondents. No real assumptions were made as to the kind and quality of education which the elementary guidance counselor should have and a variety of possible educational backgrounds was suggested. However, most factors were taken from research which suggested possible educational experiences for elementary counselors. For example, Eckerson and Smith recommend a broad liberal arts education with a major in elementary education, sociology or psychology; experience in the schools or in similar agencies; and a strong internship in elementary guidance or previous teaching experience. Their views and others influenced the selection of phrases describing the counselor's preparation.

---

[57] "The Elementary School Counselor and the Affective Domain," Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, IV, 4 (May, 1970), 351.

[58] George H. Moreau, ed. Guidance Awareness in Elementary Education (Washington: National Catholic Education Association, 1967), p. 150.

The Likert scale "makes possible the ranking of individuals in terms of the favorableness of their attitude toward a given object, but it does not provide a basis for saying how much more favorable one is than another. . . ."[59] The semantic differential is "a highly generalized technique of measurement which must be adapted to the requirements of each research problem to which it is applied."[60] With it as a measurement, "we probably tap available bases for comparison which the subject may not spontaneously think of, even though they may be valid bases."[61] The semantic differential consists of a "semantic scale between opposing polar adjectives."[62] The scale has seven units that "represent a straight line function that passes through the origin of this space and a sample of such scales that represents a multi-dimensional space."[63] Since it thus seems possible to compare favorableness and unfavorableness of attitudes more readily with the semantic differential technique, this instrument was chosen for Part III of the questionnaire. Respondents were asked to assess both the counselor's and the principal's roles in terms of the polar adjectives. The principal's role was chosen only as a filler or practice set of scales and was chosen in preference to an unrelated concept because both counselors and principals work within the same environment and in approximately the same degree of closeness to pupils and teachers despite the difference in the nature of their roles. There was no intention, however, of relating the principal's role to this study since the concern here is limited to the role of the elementary school counselor.

---

[59] Jahoda, p. 315.

[60] The Measurement of Meaning, p. 76.

---

[61] Ibid., p. 145.

[62] Ibid., p. 25.

[63] Ibid.

Of the 16 sets of adjectives, which mixed words involving activity, potency, and evaluation, eight pairs of words with evaluation factors were randomly distributed both as to their number in the total 16 and their position on the right or left side of the scale. These words, which Osgood found to have loadings of .75 or better, and thus to be clearly evaluative, were "good-bad"; "honest-dishonest"; "dirty-clean"; "cruel-kind"; "fair-unfair"; "awful-nice"; "unpleasant-pleasant"; "worthless-valuable."

Pretests

The instruments were pretested by a group of twenty-four people in education, including one counselor educator, three superintendents, eleven guidance counselors, three elementary principals, three directors of guidance and three classroom teachers. Although classroom teachers were not part of the sample for the study itself, they were included in the pretest because it was felt that they could more readily discover any omissions or confusions in the section of Part I relative to functions of the elementary guidance counselor relating to the teacher. Pretest results indicated areas, for example, on the Likert sections which seemed to cause some confusion; some respondents crossed out words in the phrases to clarify their responses. On the semantic differential section, several words were eliminated and others substituted after the pretest because the words failed to elicit any definitive response -- every respondent had placed them in the exact center, or neutral position. Problems in numbering and other format devices were also seen and corrected.

In addition to having people indicate responses on the pre-test, conferences were held with two elementary teachers, one guidance counselor and one counselor educator. Their judgments of wording and format were taken into consideration in the formulation of the final instrument. For example, one suggested that letters be used to identify phrases rather than numbers because of confusion caused by the fact that numbers were used to identify the degree of response as well.

Mailing Procedures

The final version of the instrument was sent to the entire sample on the same day, October 1, 1971, with a return request in 15 days and a stamped, self-addressed envelope included. Return envelopes were coded under the stamp so that follow-up letters would be minimized. The first follow-up, occurring three weeks after the first mailing, October 23, consisted of a reminder letter which also extended the time for response because of the failure of the post office to deliver the questionnaires promptly (some took as long as three weeks for arrival, it was learned). These were sent to all those who had not returned their questionnaires. A third follow-up was sent to principals only on November 4 because the response from principals was negligible at that time. A final follow-up, which included another questionnaire, was sent to all respondents on November 15. The final cut-off date was fixed for December 1.

Statistical Applications for Analysis of Data

There are several problems involved in the use of statistical techniques in analyzing data. The first of these is dealing with populations of unequal size. The Mann-Whitney U Test, according to several statisticians, is the most significant for revealing differences in such populations. It is a more powerful test than the median test because it considers the rank value of each response. Its power-efficiency is "95 per cent even for moderate-sized samples."[64] Thus it has great power to reject the null hypothesis. This test was, therefore, of particular importance to this study. With it, each sample could be compared to the counselor sample, comparing, for example, "what is" as ranked by the total counselor sample, with "what is" as ranked by one of the other groups. For the U test a non-parametric test, "the null hypothesis is that A and B have the same distribution."[65] The U test is computed by applying the formula:

---

[64] Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1956), p. 126.

$$U = N_1N_2 \quad \frac{N_1(N + 1)}{2} - R_1$$

where N_1 equals the size of group 1; N_2 equals the size of group 2 and R_1 equals the summation of the rated scores for group 1 (the smaller group). The U is then converted to the probability level (p) or level of difference. In a one-tailed test, the rejection region for the null hypothesis is equal to or less than .05.[66] The Mann-Whitney U Test was applied to all five samples, comparing the counselor group's responses to every item in Part I with each of the other groups' responses. Responses to both "what is" and "what should be" were statistically compared for all groups, each against the response of the counselors in Part I. The intent was to prove the rejection of the null hypothesis and thus affirm the hypothesis that A and B do not have the same distribution, that A is greater than B, and therefore A and B come from different populations.

Another problem involved in analyzing the research data is dealing with related samples. It was necessary to compare the responses to "what is" and "what should be" within each group: counselor response to "what is" compared to counselor response to "what should be," for example. Responses, then, to Part I were analyzed by a second non-parametric test, the Friedman Two-way Analysis of Variance. The null hypothesis for the Friedman test is "that the k samples have been drawn from the same population."[67] The formula applied is:

---

[65] Ibid., p. 116.

[66] Ibid., p. 118.

$$Xr^2 = \frac{12}{NK\ (K + 1)} \sum_{j=1}^{k} (Rj)^2 - 3N\ (K + 1)$$

where N equals the number of rows; K equals the number of columns; Rj equals the sum of the ranks in j columns and $^{k}_{j\ \ 1}$ directs one to sum the squares of the sums of ranks over the k conditions. Since the samples are matched, they are of equal size. As in the Mann-Whitney U Test, the Xr^2 is converted to a p score, which reveals any significant scores at a level of .05 or less, thus rejecting the null hypothesis in that region. The test is particularly sensitive to any differences in response within a single group and thus is a significant analysis for comparing each group's response to "what is" and "what should be" on the Lickert-type scales. In comparing the Xr^2 test with the F test, the most powerful parametric test of variance,

---

[67] Ibid., p. 166.

Friedman found that after "56 independent analyses of data which were suitable for analysis by the parametric F test and which were analyzed by that test and by the nonparametric Xr^2 test . . . the results give a good idea of the efficiency of the Xr^2 test as compared to the . . . F test."[68] He found that his test and the F tests yielded essentially the same probability levels in 45 out of the 56 cases. Moreover, in no case did one yield a probability of less than .01 while the other yielded a probability of more than .05. The results are so favorable that Siegel comments that "it would be difficult or even impossible to say which is the more powerful test."[69]

Two parametric tests were also applied to the Likert-type scales: the mean and the standard deviation, which test for central tendency and range. The standard deviation gives the range within which about two-thirds of the responses lie. The greater the range of responses, the greater the standard deviation. Thus differences of response can be compared according to the standard deviation. The application of these tests was to reinforce the findings of the nonparametric tests and further analyze the differences between the compared responses. The standard deviation was used to find the summed responses of each sample to each area of question s, "child," "parent," etc., in Part I.

---

[68] Ibid., p. 172

[69] Ibid.

Since the same conditions, independent groups of unequal size and a ranked response, exist for Part II statements a-p, the Mann-Whitney U test, the mean and the standard deviation were used to analyze the data obtained in the first part of Part II. The Friedman test could not be applied to Part II since all populations were of unequal size and there was no demand for two responses by a single individual to the same statement; thus there was no matched sample to analyze. The open-ended questions of Part II, which could not be tested arithmetically, were summed and ranked according to the number of times the same response occurred. The summed responses of each sample were then compared to those of the other samples and likenesses and differences analyzed. The relation between these answers and others throughout the test was evaluated. For example, a response to questions, rank order of elementary counselor functions, could be compared with the ratings given these or similar functions in Part I. Consistency of response could be noted as well as the respondent's elaboration upon his controlled response.

In Part III the only concept of research interest on the Semantic Differential Scale is the counselor role, and only eight evaluative factors were included for analysis. The major analytical methods used were computation of the arithmetic mean and an analysis of variance, using the parametric F test. The null hypothesis of the F test is that all samples have the same mean: that the difference in the means is not statistically significant. This test plus an examination of the means themselves allowed a close comparison of attitudes toward the counselor role and revealed the predominant counselor image for the five populations involved in the study. Each bi-polar scale required two responses from the person responding: one, the choice of direction; the other, the choice of degree. Since there are eight scales and seven positions on each scale, an individual could attain a score as high as 56 or as low as eight if he responded to all eight pairs. Analysis by individuals is not significant for this study, however. Therefore groups were compared, not only for the mean of their response to an individual scale, but also for the summation of their responses to the total scale, thus for the total group score and for the variance from the mean of the total five groups.

The information supplied by the counselor educators on the three special questions added to their questionnaires in regard to counselor education programs presently in operation at their colleges or universities was compared to the responses of the various populations to those items in Part II relative to counselor education. In effect, then, the "actual" education was thus compared to the "ideal" as indicated by the sum of the educator's responses.

Thus a variety of both parametric and nonparametric statistics and informal analyses were used to analyze the data resulting from the questionnaires and to make statistical inferences about the attitudes toward the elementary school guidance counselor's role and the dichotomy between the perceived and the actual role.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Returns

Of a total of 343 questionnaires which were sent out to a sample representing five different populations, a total of 175 or 51% were returned. One hundred and thirteen counselor questionnaires were mailed; 79 were returned, or 69.9%. Ninety-nine questionnaires were mailed to principals; 33 or 33.3% were returned. Sixty questionnaires were mailed to directors; 35 or 58.3% were returned. Twelve questionnaires were sent to counselor educators; 8 were returned, or 66.6%. Fifty-nine questionnaires were mailed to superintendents; 20 or 34% were returned. Of those who responded, not all responded to every question. Some, for example, left blank the "what is" columns of Part I, stating that they only had a part-time elementary counselor, or that they only had an adjustment counselor. A number of persons did not respond to Part III, the Semantic Differential scales. Some persons answered all sections but the open-ended questions. Thus a group which began with as many as 79 respondents, the counselors, might have as few respondents as 67 on a particular question and as many as 79 responses on other questions.

In the compilation of all data the answers for each particular question were taken into consideration so that all statistics would be valid.

Questionnaire Part I

Child: What is. In the analysis and evaluation of responses to Part A, Part I of the questionnaire, "Child: What is," respondents were asked to circle the number from 1 to 5 which best indicated their opinion of each function listed. One (1) indicated that the respondent did not consider that function important; two (2), that it was of slight importance; three (3), moderately important; four (4), very important; and five (5), essential. Table 1:1 gives the results of these responses expressed as means and listed according to the group represented. From this table it can be seen that the function with the highest mean for all groups as indicated by its total average mean is item *a*, "counseling individuals and groups," (See Appendix B for Questionnaire and wording of items for all tables discussed in this chapter.) The total average mean of *e* is 3.89. Principals rated *e* lowest of the groups, with a 2.83 mean, while counselor educators rated it highest with a 4.85 mean. Among counselors "counseling individuals and groups," item *e*, ranked third and was preceded by *i* (ranked first), "identifying special students," and *h*," interpreting test results."

Table 1:1
Child-What is
Table of Means

Item	Coun.	Prin.	Dir.	Supt.	Educ.	Total
a	2.69	2.03	2.87	3.10	3.14	2.77
b	3.53	3.47	3.15	3.70	2.35	3.34
c	3.19	3.17	3.06	2.00	2.57	2.30
d	2.12	1.47	2.39	1.70	3.00	2.13
e	3.63	2.83	4.06	4.10	4.85	3.89
f	1.58	1.43	1.78	1.60	3.00	1.86
g	2.97	2.65	2.90	2.90	2.00	2.68
h	3.82	3.13	3.31	3.20	4.00	3.59
i	4.01	3.60	3.75	3.40	4.00	3.75
j	2.01	1.53	2.12	2.50	4.14	2.46

Counselor educators ranked these two items in a tied third position, putting "providing career information," item *j*, as well as item *e* before them. None of the people actually working in the schools, however, saw "providing career information" as more than slightly important in the counselor's actual functioning in the elementary schools. In fact, principals ranked that function third from lowest and counselors ranked it second from lowest, placing lower only "teach subject matter of guidance," item *f*, which all four groups in the schools placed in the position of least importance. Thus the total average mean for item f is the lowest of all the items. The mean for "counseling only individually," item c, is the lowest mean for the educators while the other four groups' means for "counseling only in groups" item d, are lower than that for item c. We notice further that the means of the various groups spread from 1.43 to 4.85, a wide spread from "not important" to "very important," with 7 means being in the "not important" group and 7 being in the "very important" group. To examine the group ranking more carefully, we might look at table 1:2 where functions are ranked by each group according to the mean of the group's responses to the item.

Table 1:2
Rank Order of Means: Child-What Is

Item	Coun.	Prin.	Dir.	Supt.	Educ.	Total
a	7	7	7	5	5	6
b	4	2	4	2	8	4
c	5	3	5	8	9	5
d	8	9	8	9	6.5	9
e	3	5	1	1	1	1
f	10	10	10	10	6.5	10
g	6	6	6	6	10	7
h	2	4	2	4	3.5	3
i	1	1	3	3	3.5	2
j	9	8	9	7	2	8

Table 1:3
MANN-WHITNEY U TEST

Child-What Is
Values of p*

Item	Prin.	Dir.	Supt.	Educ.
a	.048	.028	.075	.004
b	.008	.008	.075	.004
c	.004	.016	.016	.004
d	.048	.183	.048	.008
e	.075	.075	.048	.008
f	.242	.345	.210	.048
g	.006	.008	.004	.004
h	.006	.008	.004	.004
i	.155	.183	.075	.033
j	.111	.155	.028	.004

*Values of p significant at .05 level or below.

The Mann-Whitney U test is not concerned with rank placement of items as compared with one another, _a_'s relation to _b_ and _c_, etc., but is concerned with the score given to each item by each individual and the direction of distribution of these scores among the respondents. The assumption is that the samples came from normal populations with equal standard deviations. On item a for example, we see that the null hypothesis is rejected for all but the superintendents group where A and B do not have the same distribution of scores and A and B do not come from like populations. The tally for this particular item shows the gollowing results:

Counselors:	1:14	2:23	3:22	4:11	5:8
Principals:	1:15	2:3	3:9	4:2	5:1
Directors:	1:5	2:6	3:15	4:2	5:5
Superintendents:	1:4	2:0	3:8	4:6	5:2
Educators:	1:1	2:3	3:1	4:0	6:1

We see that more than 50% of the counselors ranked item 1 either 2 or 3, and that the bulk of the responses lie between 1 and 3. The principals, although the bulk of the responses also lie between 1 and 3, place 50% of the responses on 1. The directors, who again place the bulk of the responses between 1 and 3, place almost half on 3 and the spread is almost perfect between 1 and 5. The educators place 50% of the responses on 2, spread between 1 and 5 and have 2/3 of the response lying between 1 and 2. The superintendents, however, for whom we must accept the null hypothesis, place their emphasis on 3 and the mean of their responses is just over 3 with the bulk of response, 80%, lying between 3 and 5. By accepting the null hypothesis, we assert that the difference between A and B is a matter of chance in the case of the superintendents.

Looking across the columns of Table 1:3, we note that on item f, where there was great agreement of ranking as Table 1:2 shows, we must accept the null hypothesis for all but the counselor educators, whose p value is close to .05, however. The same is true for item i and almost the same for item j.

Parent-What Is: Table 1:4 shows the means of the responses of five groups to the items on Part I, B, "Parent-What is". From this table we see that the item ranked highest is item c "interpret test results." Ranking a close second and third are items d and e, "Act as liaison with school personnel" and "recommend outside agencies," respectively. Ranked as of least importance is item i, "provide occupational information." "Home visits", item a, and item g, "conduct group counseling," also are ranked low, as functions apparently not of major importance in the present actual functions of the elementary school counselor.

Table 1:4
Parent-What Is: Table of Means

Item	Coun.	Prin.	Dir.	Supt.	Educ.	Total
a	2.38	2.28	2.45	3.00	1.67	2.36
b	4.13	3.21	4.31	4.70	3.00	3.87
c	3.47	2.90	3.72	4.20	2.50	3.36
d	4.06	3.34	4.24	4.50	2.50	3.73
e	4.08	3.17	4.15	4.20	3.00	3.72
f	3.38	3.45	3.69	3.30	2.67	3.30
g	2.14	2.18	2.62	2.40	2.17	2.30
h	2.99	2.34	3.15	3,50	2.83	2.69
i	1.91	1.55	2.58	2.70	2.00	2.15

A look at table 1:5 reveals the ranks assigned to the various functions in relation to parents.

Table 1:5
Rank Order of Means: Parent-What Is

Item	Coun.	Prin.	Dir.	Supt.	Educ.	Total
a	7	7	9	7	9	7
b	1	3	1	1	1.5	1
c	4	5	4	3.5	5.5	4
d	3	2	2	2	5.5	2
e	2	4	3	3.5	1.5	3
f	5	1	5	6	4	5
g	8	8	7	9	7	8
h	6	6	6	5	3	6
i	9	9	8	8	8	9

Here we see that the item ranked highest or of first importance in the current actual practices of the elementary school counselor is item b, "consultations in school." Had we used only the total mean average as indicator of importance, we would have assumed that item c was the most important function presently carried on in the guidance role. When the items are assigned ranks, we note that item c has an overall rank of 4, in fact, and ranges from a tied rank of 3 to a tied rank of 5 among the samples. Of second importance in the schools the consensus is to rank item d, "act as liaison with school personnel," although again we see that the range of reply spreads from 2 to a tied fifth place. Of least importance, rank 9, is "provide occupational information," item i. This ranking agrees with our observations on the basis of the mean table. Interestingly all of the samples accord "home visits" a low rank while according "school consultations" a high rank. Apparently it is the current trend for parents to come to the school and not for the school to go to the parents. Although principals rank "individual counseling," item g as of prime importance, generally it would seem that the direction of the counselor activities in connection with the parents is toward consultation, interpretation of tests and liaison with

Table 1:6
MANN-WHITNEY U TEST
Parent-What Is
Values of p*

Item	Prin.	Dir.	Supt.	Educ.
a	.038	.038	.016	.004
b	.274	.183	.075	.022
c	.016	.028	.012	.004
d	.210	.133	.061	.008
e	.061	.155	.093	.008
f	.006	.016	.004	.004
g	.093	.155	.075	.004
h	.111	.006	.006	.004
i	.075	.210	.061	.004

*Value of p significant at .05 level or below.

other school personnel, rather than personal or group counseling or providing more general information of an educational or occupational type.

Table 1:6 shows the results of the U Test, giving the p values. The null hypothesis is rejected in 17 cases and accepted in 19 cases. In every case the educators show a dramatic difference from the counselor distribution. Superintendents and directors show a probability of error not attributable to chance in three cases and principals in two cases. If we analyze one tally, item *e*, we find the following results:

Counselors:	1:2	2:4	3:14	4:25	5:34
Principals:	1:6	2:2	3:8	4:7	5:6
Directors:	1:0	2:1	3:8	4:9	5:15
Superintendents:	1:0	2:0	3:6	4:4	5:10
Educators:	1:0	2:2	3:1	4:0	5:2

We note that all groups except the educators seem to have a movement toward the right whereas the educators have two highs, at 2 and 5. For item 2 we must reject the null hypothesis that the groups A and B have the same distribution when we compare the educators and the counselors and accept it when the B group represents either the principals, directors or superintendents.

Teacher-What Is: Part C of Part I is concerned with counselor functions in relation to the teacher. Table 1:7 presents the means of the responses of all five groups to the items concerned with teachers.

Table 1:7
Teacher What Is: Table of Means

Item	Coun.	Prin.	Dir.	Supt.	Educ.	Total
a	2.93	2.39	3.33	3.50	3.33	3.10
b	2.01	2.46	1.93	2.90	2.83	2.43
c	3.68	3.07	3.78	3.20	2.83	3.51
d	4.09	3.32	4.42	4.30	3.33	3.89
e	2.55	1.96	3.12	3.00	2.83	2.69
f	2.56	1.71	2.84	2.50	2.50	2.42
g	3.44	2.79	3.61	4.00	2.50	3.26
h	3.85	3.11	3.94	3.70	3.17	3.55
i	3.81	2.89	4.06	3.70	2.33	3.36

We discover that six of the nine items is ranked on the total average means as at least moderately important, with item d "provide information on child" as most important and items h and c, "provide crisis intervention" and "interpret test results" ranking a close second and third. The three items which the total samples collectively ranked of only slight importance were items b, e and f: "assist in discipline", "provide in-service training" and "encourage counseling of teachers." B and f, we note, tended to rank under 3 in every population while item e, "provide in-service training" ranked of moderate importance only to top administrators, superintendents and directors. Directors have the greatest spread of means, ranging from 1.93 to 4.42 while educators have the least spread of means, ranging from 2.40 to 3.33. For the standard deviation of the various groups in their responses to each set of items, see Appendix A. Table 1:8 shows the rank order of means for each group and for the total of the groups.

Table 1:8
Rank Order of Means: Teacher-What Is

Item	Coun.	Prin.	Dir.	Supt.	Educ.	Total
a	6	7	6	5	1.5	6
b	9	6	9	8	5	8
c	4	3	4	6	5	3
d	1	1	1	1	1.5	1
e	8	8	7	7	5	7
f	7	9	8	9	7.5	9
g	5	5	5	2	7.5	5
h	2	2	3	3.5	3	2
i	3	4	2	3.5	9	4

As we expect on the basis of the Table of Means, item d ranks first for every group, tied only with item a for counselor educators. We would assume from the prominance that counselor educators give item a, "assist in group testing," that counselors are trained for this function as one of major importance to their role but that in fact it ranks only among the less important of their tasks as seen by the counselors themselves and by other persons in the school. Again on item i, "suggest alternate methods for relating to individuals," there is wide disagreement between those responsible for counselor preparation and those directly in charge of counselor functions. Counselor educators rank item _i_ as of least importance among those functions listed, while personnel involved in counselor functions in the schools rank it in second, third or at least fourth position of importance. Both principals and counselor educators tend to see counselors as taking a fairly active role in discipline, as indicated by item _b_, while other groups list this of least importance. This item supports one of the major conflicts that other studies have revealed between principals and counselors. As is generally the case, directors agree almost perfectly with the counselor perception of his functions while superintendents tend to disagree frequently.

Table 1:9 presents the Values of p for the Mann-Whitney U Test on the Teacher-What Is items. From Table 1:7 and 1:8 we would expect that we must accept the null hypothesis for item _d_ for all groups. Table 1:9 confirms our expectations since all groups have a value of p greater than .05. Also as we would expect from the previous tables, since educators agree with counselors only on item _d_ of all items, only on item _d_ can we accept the null hypothesis for these two groups. Since directors and counselors tend to agree most of the time, the value of p for the directors is greater than .05 in all

Table 1:9
MANN-WHITNEY U TEST
Teacher-What Is
Values of p*

Item	Prin.	Dir.	Supt.	Educ.
a	.004	.004	.004	.004
b	.061	.048	.006	.004
c	.048	.111	.008	.004
d	.061	.183	.111	.061
e	.016	.016	.006	.004
f	.038	.038	.022	.004
g	.016	.048	.012	.004
h	.111	.075	.038	.004
i	.075	.075	.038	.008

*Values of p significant at .05 or below.

but two cases. We might examine item h closely since it presents a situation where statistically we are forced to accept the null hypothesis for two groups, the principals and the directors, and to reject the null hypothesis for two groups, the superintendents and the educators.

Counselors:	1:6	2:4	3:16	4:23	5:30
Principals:	1:6	2:3	3:8	4:4	5:7
Directors:	1:1	2:3	3:8	4:5	5:15
Superintendents:	1:0	2:0	3:12	4:2	5:6
Educators:	1:0	2:2	3:2	4:1	5:1

We note that principals, directors and counselors all move upward on the right, while superintendents move upward at the middle and back downward at the right; their value of p is fairly close to .05, however, and although we reject the null hypothesis, we can see that the difference in the direction of their distribution is not so great as is that of the educators. There we notice that the middle is spread between 2 and 3 and returns halfway to the position of 1 for 4 and 5. The null hypothesis is rejected a total of 26 times out of 36, thus we can affirm generally the alternate hypothesis that the groups come from populations with different distributions and thus from unlike populations.

Administration-What Is: Table 1:10 lists the means for the responses to Part I, D --"Administration, What-Is" where the functions of the counselor in relation to the administration are rated by the respondents.

Table 1:10
Administration-What Is: Table of Means

Item	Coun.	Prin.	Dir.	Supt.	Educ.	Total
a	2.09	2.67	2.45	3.50	3.33	2.81
b	1.33	1.38	1.15	1.60	2.50	1.59
c	3.57	2.80	3.36	3.60	3.17	3.28
d	2.14	1.93	2.03	2.50	2.83	2.29
e	3.22	2.41	3.45	3.60	2.67	3.07
f	2.82	2.76	2.75	3.40	3.33	3.01
g	1.82	1.43	1.72	2.60	1.67	1.85
h	2.30	2.10	2.45	2.90	2.67	2.48

We note that the central tendency tends to be very low on items b and g where the consensus is that these items, "substitute when needed" and "write federal projects" respectively, rank between not important and slightly important. We would make the assumption that most counselors do little of either of these tasks now and are not expected to do so by the other groups. The only items which counselor educators rank as at least moderately important functions for the counselor in his relations with the administration are items a, f and c: "maintain a central record file," "provide reports of counselor activities," and "recommend group or grade placement" in that order. Counselors tend to consider the last of these, recommending placement, as at least moderately important but they generally consider the more routine office functions as of only slight importance in their functions with administration. Principals tend to rank all functions with administration as less than moderately important since the highest mean for principal response is 2.76. We might note that in no case is there a mean of 4.0 or higher, as there were on items relating to the child, the parent and the teacher. We might assume that the respondents generally consider their functions in relation to administration as of less importance than those with the previously mentioned groups. In fact, only 4 of the items achieved a mean average of better than 3 for any of the groups, which means that 4 items were considered of slight or no importance to all of the groups and only 4 were considered of moderate importance to any one or more of the groups.

Table 1:11 shows the ranks assigned to the counselor role in relation to the administration.

Table 1:11
Administration-What Is: Rank Order of Means

Item	Coun.	Prin.	Dir.	Supt.	Educ.	Total
a	6	3	4.5	3	1.5	4
b	8	8	8	8	7	8
c	1	2	2	1.5	3	1
d	5	6	6	7	4	6
e	2	4	1	1.5	5.5	2
f	3	1	3	4	1.5	3
g	7	7	7	6	8	7
h	4	5	4.5	5	5.5	5

We note that of the 8 items, as we would expect, all groups tend to rank items b and g as of least importance. On this part of the questionnaire we notice that counselors and directors tend to disagree frequently, possibly because directors are among the administration and are therefore more concerned that counselors maintain a record file (item a) for example, and that they participate in workshops, although counselors rank workshop participation (item e) high also. Principals disagree with counselors on 6 of the 8 items, tending to rank all functions lower than counselors do except for reporting functions. We might assume that principals feel that they should be kept aware of what counselors are doing by means of reports and files. Superintendents and counselors rank differently in 5 or the 8 items, with superintendents tending to stress counselor files (item a) and to discount counselor help in setting up schedules (item d). Again, as was true in the three previous tables of Rank Order of Means, educators differ most widely from counselors, stressing, as noted earlier, the more clerical aspects of the counselor role, such as items a, d and f and giving less stress to items c and e, placement and workshops.

Table 1:12 shows the p values for the Mann-Whitney U Test as it evaluates the responses of the four groups as compared with the counselor group on Part D of Part I of the Questionnaire. The Mann-Whitney U Test indicates that only in 7 cases out of 32 is the null hypothesis that the groups have the same distribution accepted. Of these none occur for the comparison of counselors and counselor educators; 2 occur in the comparison of superintendents and counselors; 3 occur in the comparison of the responses of directors and counselors; and 2 occur in the comparison of the responses of principals and counselors. These cases, where the null hypothesis is accepted, are indicated by scores on the table of greater than .05. All of the other 25 cases reject the null hypothesis: that A is greater than B and that thus the respondents are not drawn from the same or like populations.

Table 1:12
MANN-WHITNEY U TEST
Administration-What Is
Values of p*

Item	Prin.	Dir.	Supt.	Educ.
a	.008	.028	.008	.004
b	.274	.155	.345	.048
c	.038	.048	.022	.004
d	.022	.061	.016	.004
e	.008	.038	.004	.004
f	.004	.004	.008	.004
g	.093	.111	.093	.008
h	.048	.048	.016	.004

*Values of p significant at .05 level or below.

Agencies and Community: What Is: Table 1:13 lists the means for the responses of the various groups to Part I, E, roles pertaining to outside agencies and community. The Table shows six mean ratings of "very important." Two of these ratings are by counselors, those for items a and b: "refer children for special services" and "provide information to outside agencies upon request," respectively. Directors also gave higher than 4 rating to item a and item b and superintendents ranked item b at 4, "very important," level, Superintendents provided the sixth mean rating of 4.00 or better in their rating of item e, "act as liaison for parents to outside agencies." Neither principals nor educators tended to rate that item even moderately important, however.

Table 1:13
Agencies and Community-What Is
Rank Order of Means

Item	Coun.	Prin.	Dir.	Supt.	Educ.	Total
a	4.01	2.90	4.14	3.70	3.00	3.55
b	4.10	3.20	4.08	4.00	2.67	3.41
c	2.75	2.43	2.63	3.44	2.33	2.72
d	3.09	2.43	3.03	3.00	2.50	2.81
e	3.43	2.73	3.61	4.00	2.50	3.25

Unlike the means shown in Table 1:10, there are no mean ratings of less than 2. We might surmise that the groups generally see functions in relation to the community and outside agencies as higher in importance than functions in relation to administration, at least as a total group. This interpretation of the statistics would support the concept that counselors should be primarily concerned with children since in working with outside agencies as referral persons and sources of information, counselors are primarily dealing with children or in the interest directly of the children. Often functions relating to administration do not relate as directly to children even though their ultimate purpose is to improve the total environment of the child. Because the questionnaire does not allow for cross ranking on Part I, we can only assume a relationship between the tables. However, later analysis of the open-ended questions in Part II will allow firmer assumptions since they require respondents to rank order the total functions of the elementary school counselor.

Table 1:14
Outside Agencies and Community-What Is
Rank Order of Means

Item	Coun.	Prin.	Dir.	Supt.	Educ.	Total
a	2	2	1	3	1	1
b	1	1	2	1.5	2	2
c	5	4.5	5	4	5	5
d	4	4.5	4	5	3.5	4
e	3	3	3	1.5	3.5	3

In Table 1:14 we have an interesting spread of rank order of means. Particularly in locating the function of most importance, there seems to be difference of opinion. For example, counselors themselves consider their most important function with outside agencies as providing information (item b). Principals agree with them and superintendents are inclined to agree with them although they rank item e. "acting as liaison for parents to outside agencies" as equal in importance. Other groups all rank item e as 3. Educators and directors, on the other hand, see the most important counselor function as item a, "refering children for special services," while they both rank item b as of second importance. There is general agreement that items c and d are of the least importance. These items refer to follow-up studies and school public relations.

Table 1:15
MANN-WHITNEY U TEST
Outside Agencies and Community: What Is
Values of p*

Item	Prin.	Dir.	Supt.	Educ.
a	.155	.155	.093	.006
b	.345	.111	.061	.008
c	.008	.012	.004	.004
d	.004	.016	.004	.004
e	.028	.048	.016	.004

*Values of p significant at .05 level or below.

On this table we see that we must accept the null hypothesis for six items of the total 20. All six of these are responses to items a and b where there is general agreement of rank and thus where we would expect that the null hypothesis would be accepted since the populations look as though they are alike and might thus have the same distribution. Items c, d and e all reveal responses which reject the null hypothesis, thus asserting that they have different distributions and have come from different populations. It might be interesting to analyze item a by looking at the tallies for that item.

Counselors:	1:4	2:3	3:12	4:29	5:31
Principals:	1:7	2:3	3:8	4:8	5:3
Directors:	1:0	2:2	3:9	4:5	5:18
Superintendents:	1:0	2:1	3:8	4:7	5:4
Educators:	1:1	2:0	3:3	4:2	5:0

Here the counselors have an increasingly upward movement to the right; principals reach a high at tied 3-4 and then have a downward movement; directors move upward to the right, with a slight dip at 4; superintendents have an upward movement to the right with a falling off at 5. Educators have a series of peaks which can best be seen if we do a straight-line extrapolation by multiplying the educator total (6) by 12 in order to have a figure closer to that of the counselors total of 79 responses. If we did so, we would see that educators would have responses of

1:12 2:0 3:36 4:24 5:0

We would thus have peaks at 1, 3 and 4 with no right upward movement, which characterizes the counselor's and other groups' responses. Thus we must reject the null hypothesis in the comparison of educators and counselors on item a of Part I,E.

Child-What Should Be: All of the five sample populations were asked on the questionnaire to respond not only to the role of the counselor as it actually is in relation to the child, parent, teacher, administration, outside agencies and community, but also to the role of the counselor as they felt it should be in relation to those people. On Table 2:1

we see a listing of the means for the various groups' responses to Part I, A, Child-What Should Be.

Table 2:1
Child-What Should Be
Table of Means

Item	Coun.	Prin.	Dir.	Supt.	Educ.	Total
a	3.56	3.56	3.69	3.50	3.14	3.49
b	2.71	3.56	3.12	3.20	2.85	3.09
c	2.83	3.06	3.03	2.22	2.57	2.74
d	2.45	2.13	2.78	1.80	3.00	2.43
e	4.33	4.03	4.62	4.40	4.85	4.44
f	2.03	3.09	2.08	2.00	3.00	2.84
g	2.76	3.87	2.81	3.30	2.00	2.95
h	4.15	4.22	4.09	3.80	4.00	4.05
i	4.35	4.39	4.00	3.80	4.00	3.91
j	2.54	2.74	2.87	3.00	4.14	3.06

The range of the means is from a low of 1.80 to a high of 4.85. Only one item is rated "not important" by one group as the average mean of their responses indicates. There are a total of 17 mean responses which rate an item as only "slightly important." Of these 17 means, 6 are the means for counselor responses, 2 for principal responses, 4 for director responses, 2 for superintendent responses and 3 for counselor educator responses. Eighteen items have a mean of 3 or "moderately important," and 14 have a mean of 4 or "very important." For every one of the five groups the mean for the responses to item e, "counseling individuals and groups," is over 4.00, indicating that all five groups consider this function very important. The means for item h, "interpreting test results," ranges from 3.80 to 4.22 with four groups rating it over 4.00. Thus we would conclude that item h is considered a function which should be very important in the counselor's role. Item i, "identifying special students," also ranges from 3.80 to 4.39 with four means being over 4.00. We would conclude that the three most important functions envisioned by all five groups on the basis of the means of their responses are items e, h and i: "counseling individuals and groups," "interpreting test results," and "identifying special students." None of the items is rated less than "moderately important" by all five groups. Closest to that rating is item d, "counseling only in groups," where 1 group rates it as "not important," 3 groups rate it as "slightly important" and 1 group rates it as "moderately important." The greatest difference in viewpoint can be seen on item j, "providing career information." Three groups, counselors, directors and principals, rate this item as "slightly important"; one group, superintendents, rate it as "moderately important," and one group, counselor educators, rate it as "very important."

Table 2:2 lists the actual ranks assigned to each task based on the mean of the responses of each group.

Table 2:2
Child-What Should Be
Rank Order of Means

Item	Coun.	Prin.	Dir.	Supt.	Educ.	Total
a	4	5.5	4	4	5	4
b	7	5.5	5	6	8	5
c	5	8	6	8	9	9
d	9	10	9	10	6.5	10
e	2	3	1	1	1	1
f	10	7	10	9	6.5	8
g	6	4	8	5	10	7
h	3	2	2	2.5	3.5	2
i	1	1	3	2.5	3.5	3
j	8	9	7	7	2	6

Table 2:2 reflects the disagreement among the five groups of respondents to the importance of the various functions which should make up the counselor's role in relation to the child. As on several of the earlier Rank Order of Means Tables, we see that the greatest agreement is between counselors and directors but there are only three points of complete agreement between them, the rankings given to items a, d, and f. Two of these responses, we note, are to those

functions which they consider of least importance. Both groups, however, list the same three functions as most important, although they order them differently. As we have come to expect from previous tables, the least agreement, in fact none, occurs between counselors and counselor educators. Educators consider item j, "providing career information," as of second importance whereas counselors and all other groups consider it of comparatively little importance among the hierarchy of functions. Superintendents agree only once with counselors although again the items which they consider in the top three positions of importance are those which the counselors also place in those positions. The same is true for the principals, the one point of agreement between the principals and the counselors being on what should be the most important function of the counselor. Both rank item i, "identifying special students," as ideally the most important function of the counselors.

Table 2:3 lists the Values of p as derived from the Mann-Whitney U Test for the five groups in response to Child-What Should Be. Table 2:3 indicates that in 23 cases, the null hypothesis, that the samples have the same distribution and therefore come from the same or like populations, is rejected and that in 17 cases the null hypothesis is accepted. Principals and directors most frequently agree, rejecting and accepting the null hypothesis for the same items. When

Table 2:3
MANN-WHITNEY U TEST
Child-What Should Be
Values of p*

Item	Prin.	Dir.	Supt.	Educ.
a	.111	.111	.016	.004
b	.028	.008	.004	.004
c	.012	.012	.016	.004
d	.075	.111	.028	.006
e	.274	.155	.075	.022
f	.075	.155	.016	.004
g	.006	.004	.004	.004
h	.242	.242	.133	.048
i	.309	.309	.012	.183
j	.008	.012	.004	.004

*Values of p significant at .05 level or below.

the null hypothesis is rejected, these groups differ in the distribution of their responses from the counselors. When the null hypothesis is accepted, these groups are like the counselors in the distribution of their responses. We may analyze this concept by examining the tally for one of the items. Since item i shows a rather unusual situation for this study, namely that the educators' distribution is like that of the counselors and the superintendents is the only distribution of all of the groups which is unlike that of the counselors, let us look at the tallies for item i.

Counselors:	1:0	2:1	3:11	4:26	5:41
Principals:	1:2	2:0	3:3	4:6	5:21
Directors:	1:0	2:3	3:10	4:4	5:16
Superintendents:	1:4	2:0	3:2	4:4	5:10
Educators:	1:0	2:1	3:1	4:2	5:3

If we do a straight line extrapolation for superintendents, multiplying their responses by 3 in order to bring their total of responses closer to that of counselors, we note that unlike any other group, they rank 1 in a tied second position with 4. This gives a series of highs, 1, 4 and 5, unlike that of any other group. We do note that the direction of the principals is essentially the same as that of the superintendents, yet the height of the peak at 1 is much lower in comparison to the height of the peaks of 3,4 and 5 and the upward right movement from rank 4 to 5 is great. Thus diagrammatically we can support the distribution evaluation presented to us by the value of p.

Parent-What Should Be: Moving to a discussion of the responses of Parent-What Should Be, we see that Table 2:4 presents the means of the responses to the items in that category. Twenty-one group means indicate that items are of a "very important" nature. Five of these means are for item *b*, "consultations in school." We could infer, then, that all groups consider school consultation with parents of great importance and a function which should be given much stress by the counselor. Three of the groups rated item *e*, "recommend outside agencies" as a "very important" function and the fourth group rated it as close to that, 3.90. We might conclude that all groups see this function as one of importance in the ideal functioning of the counselor in relation to the parent. None of the items was rated less than 2; therefore none of the items was rated of no importance. In fact, only 2 items received even a single rating of between 2 and 3, thus "slightly important." These items were items e, "provide occupational information," ranked in the 2 range by all but the counselor educators; and item a, "home visits" ranked in the 2 range by the directors of guidance. Here the directors disagree with all other groups, who all considered home visits of at least moderate importance. The majority

Table 2:4
Parent-What Should Be
Table of Means

Item	Coun.	Prin.	Dir.	Supt.	Educ.	Total
a	3.34	3.71	2.61	3.30	3.85	3.36
b	4.43	4.13	4.61	4.80	4.14	4.52
c	3.83	3.61	4.12	4.50	4.14	4.04
d	4.40	4.10	4.53	4.80	3.85	4.42
e	4.34	4.23	4.26	3.90	4.43	4.23
f	3.83	4.19	4.00	3.60	3.43	3.81
g	3.32	3.40	3.53	3.40	3.43	3.42
h	3.55	3.83	3.94	4.10	4.14	3.91
i	2.50	2.53	2.97	3.30	4.14	3.09

of the means indicate that all of the functions in connection with the parents should be of importance in the functioning of the counselor role. Table 2:5 shows the actual ranking of each of the functions by the several groups.

Table 2:5
Parent-What Should Be
Rank Order of Means

Item	Coun.	Prin.	Dir.	Supt.	Educ.	Total
a	7	6	9	8.5	6.5	8
b	1	3	1	1.5	3.5	1
c	4.5	7	4	3	3.5	4
d	2	4	2	1.5	6.5	2
e	3	1	3	5	1	3
f	4.5	2	5	6	8.5	6
g	8	8	7	7	8.5	7
h	6	5	6	4	3.5	5
i	9	9	8	8.5	3.5	9

Directors and counselors essentially agree on 6 of the 9 items in the order of their importance to the ideal functioning of the counselor. Principals and counselors agree only twice; superintendents and counselors agree only in their choice of the two most important functions of the counselor in relation to the parent, both rating as most important functions b and d, "consultations in school" and "act as liaison with school personnel." Counselor educators and counselors agree in only one case, both ranking item *g*, "conduct group counseling," as number 8, thus of comparatively less importance than most other items. Interestingly, these two groups do not even have a consensus on the five most important functions Frequently we can see that counselor educators rank a function low when counselors rank it high and the reverse. Perhaps most surprising among the results is the lack of stress put on "home visits," which counselors rank as 7, and all rank 6 or lower. Table 2:6 shows the values of p derived from the Mann-Whitney U Test and thus reveals the differences and similarities in distribution of responses by the five groups of respondents.

Table 2:6
MANN-WHITNEY U TEST
Parent-What Should Be
Values of p*

Item	Prin.	Dir.	Supt.	Educ.
a	.028	.022	.004	.004
b	.210	.274	.075	.048
c	.093	.093	.048	.016
d	.345	.183	.075	.061
e	.183	.274	.012	.075
f	.075	.111	.500	.004
g	.061	.111	.048	.004
h	.048	.075	.028	.004
i	.008	.012	.004	.004

*Values of p significant at .05 level or below.

The table shows that for item a all groups reject the null hypothesis that the groups have the same distribution. On item b only the educator group has a different distribution and thus rejects the null hypothesis. The same is true for items b, d, and f. On item c only the superintendents and educators reject the null hypothesis. On item e only the superintendents reject the null hypothesis. On g both the superintendents and educators reject the null hypothesis; on h all but the directors reject the null hypothesis; and on item i all groups reject the null hypothesis, thus disagree in their distribution with the counselor group. We find, then, that we must accept the null hypothesis in 18 cases and that we must reject it or reserve judgment in 18 cases.

Teacher-What Should Be: On Table 2:7 we find the lists of means for the responses of all groups to the statements of functions of the counselor in relation to teachers.

Table 2:7
Teacher-What Should Be
Table of Means

Item	Coun.	Prin.	Dir.	Supts.	Educ.	Totals
a	3.15	3.06	3.15	4.00	3.85	3.44
b	2.00	2.71	2.06	3.10	3.00	2.57
c	4.04	3.74	4.30	4.10	3.43	3.92
d	4.35	4.50	4.59	4.70	4.14	4.45
e	3.77	3.47	4.03	3.60	4.71	3.92
f	3.30	3.35	3.59	3.30	3.57	3.42
g	3.91	3.71	4.15	4.20	4.29	4.05
h	4.05	4.00	4.34	4.20	3.85	4.09
i	4.23	4.42	4.18	4.30	4.71	4.37

On the entire table there are only 3 ratings according to the means of the responses of less than 3.00, thus of less than moderate importance. All of these ratings are given to item b, "Assist in discipline." Only superintendents and counselor educators see the function as ideally a part of the counselor role in relation to teachers. All but two of the items, item b and item f, "encourage counseling of teachers", have at least one mean of over 4.00, thus rating them as "very important." Item f is, in fact, ranked as "moderately important" by all five groups. Item d, "provide information on child" to the teacher, is ranked as very important by all groups and, as we will note on Table 2:8, ranks highest on the total average of means, with only the counselor educators differing with that opinion.

Table 2:8
Teacher-What Should Be
Rank Order of Means

Item	Coun.	Prin.	Dir.	Supt.	Educ.	Total
a	8	8	8	6	5.5	7
b	9	9	9	9	9	9
c	4	4	3	5	8	5.5
d	1	1	1	1	4	1
e	6	6	6	7	1.5	5.5
f	7	7	7	8	7	8
g	5	5	5	3.5	3	4
h	3	3	2	3.5	5.5	3
i	2	2	4	2	1.5	2

This table reveals that on functions relating to the teacher, counselors and principals have the most agreement, agreeing on the rank order of all of the 9 functions listed. This consensus is significant, especially in view of the fact that principals and counselors tend to disagree guite frequently in their responses to the counselor role in relation to other people, such as the child and parent. It is also significant that counselors and directors agree on only 5 of the 9 items listed whereas they generally tend to have a closer agreement of counselor role. Educators and superintendents, however, generally tend to disagree with counselors' views of the ideal ranking of functions in relation to teachers, with superintendents agreeing with counselors on only 4 of the 9 items and counselor educators agreeing on only 2 of the 9 items. It is interesting that despite the fact that some of the groups indicated that they felt that item b, "assist in discipline," should be of moderate importance, all five groups ranked this item in ninth position, or of least importance in the total functioning of the counselor in his relations with the teacher.

Table 2:9 gives the Values of p derived from the Mann-Whitney U Test which tested the hypothesis that all groups have the same distribution and thus come from the same or like populations.

Table 2:9
MANN-WHITNEY U TEST
Teacher-What Should Be
Values of p*

Item	Prin.	Dir.	Supt.	Educ.
a	.004	.004	.004	.004
b	.028	.048	.006	.004
c	.155	.210	.111	.038
d	.155	.155	.093	.004
e	.183	.111	.111	.016
f	.012	.022	.016	.004
g	.133	.061	.111	.016
h	.183	.155	.111	.016
i	.048	.155	.155	.028

*Values of p significant at .05 level or below.

The educators, Table 2:9 shows, have a significantly different distribution from that of the counselors in every case. Principals have a significantly different distribution in 4 cases of the 9; directors in 3 cases of the 9; and superintendents in 2 cases of the 9. We might examine item i, where there are two groups for which the null hypothesis must be accepted and two groups for which it must be rejected.

Counselors:	1:2	2:2	3:9	4:29	5:37
Principals:	1:1	2:0	3:3	4:8	5:19
Directors:	1:1	2:1	3:7	4:6	5:18
Superintendents:	1:0	2:0	3:4	4:6	5:10
Educators:	1:0	2:0	3:0	4:2	5:5

To look first at the distribution of the three which are similar, we note that the counselors, directors and superintendents all have a distribution which moves equally from 1 to 2 and then moves upward to the right. Principals we note move downward from 1 to 2, then slowly upward to 4 and then dramatically right and upward at 5. Educators maintain a straight line at 0 for numbers 1, 2 and 3 and then move rapidly right and upward to 4 and 5. Thus we must reject the null hypothesis for these latter two groups and accept the alternate hypothesis which states that the groups come from different populations and have a distribution unlike that of the counselors. We note that of the 36 cases, the null hypothesis is rejected a total of 19 times, and accepted a total of 17 times.

Administration-What Should Be: Table 2:10 gives the means for the five groups in response to the items on Part I, D, Administration-What Should Be. Table 2:10 indicates that 3 items receive a consistent rating of less than moderate importance. These functions are b, "substitute when needed"; d, "help in scheduling," and g, "write federal projects." All groups, then, feel that these three functions should be of little importance in the total role of the elementary guidance counselor in relation to the administration. No items are frequently ranked as very important, thus better than 4.00, although 4 items receive at least one rating of better than 4.00: items a, c, e, and f which are respectively: "maintain central record file," "recommend group or grade placement," "participate in workshops," and "provide reports of counselor activities." We see that superintendents tend to stress the more routine or clerical functions, rating items a and f as "very important." Counselors rank only 1 item as very important, item c -- recommending placement of children. Educators rank as very important only item e, "participate in workshops." They regard this function along with items c, placement, and f, reporting counselor activities, as ideally the three most important functions of the counselor in relation to the administration. The range of means goes from 1.00 -- absolutely not important -- to 4.29, very important. Table 2:11 shows the actual rank of means for each of the five groups responding to the questionnaire. There is a consensus on item b, which all groups rank in eighth place, and a good agreement on items e, g, h and f which are generally ranked 1, 7, 5 and 3 respectively. There is wide disagreement on c, "group placement," with principals and superintendents tending to give that function must less emphasis ideally than the other three groups. Counselors, as we have noted, feel that ideally that is the counselor's most important function in relation to the administration. There is also wide disagreement on item a, maintaining central files, with the superintendent and principal ranking that function as of more importance than it is ranked by any of the other groups. Educators tend to place that item low on the list of counselor tasks.

Table 2:10
Administration-What Should Be
Table of Means

Item	Coun.	Prin.	Dir.	Supt.	Educ.	Total
a	3.05	3.60	2.78	4.10	2.00	3.11
b	1.41	1.81	1.05	1.50	1.00	1.35
c	4.02	3.51	3.57	3.40	3.57	3.61
d	2.43	2.64	2.26	2.70	1.43	2.27
e	3.77	3.83	3.94	4.10	4.29	3.99
f	3.09	3.61	3.09	4.00	3.48	3.45
g	2.19	2.48	2.12	2.90	2.48	2.43
h	2.72	3.35	2.67	3.90	2.43	3.01

Table 2:11
Administration-What Should Be
Rank Order of Means

Item	Coun.	Prin.	Dir.	Supt.	Educ.	Total
a	4	3	4	1.5	6	4
b	8	8	8	8	8	8
c	1	4	2	5	2	2
d	6	6	6	7	7	7
e	2	1	1	1.5	1	1
f	3	2	3	3	3	3
g	7	7	7	6	4	6
h	5	5	5	4	5	5

Table 2:12 reveals the values of p for the Mann-Whiteny U Test and thus shows the number of rejections and acceptances of the null hypothesis that the groups have the same distribution and thus come from the same or like populations.

Table 2:12
MANN-WHITNEY U TEST
Administration-What Should Be
Values of p*

Item	Prin.	Dir.	Supt.	Educ.
a	.006	.022	.008	.004
b	.210	.133	.183	.111
c	.022	.155	.111	.028
d	.012	.061	.004	.004
e	.133	.111	.111	.016
f	.004	.008	.004	.004
g	.111	.133	.028	.006
h	.008	.008	.004	.004

*Values of p significant at .05 level or below.

The null hypothesis is rejected a total of 21 times out of 32. This means that we must accept the null hypothesis 11 times, that in 11 cases the distribution of the group being compared with the counselors is so similar to that of the counselors that the difference is no more than what might be attributed to chance. We see that on items a, f and h we must reject the null hypothesis for every group, but that on item b we must accept the null hypothesis for every group.

Since b is the only item which all groups ranked in exactly the same position (as Table 2:11 shows), we would expect that the results of the Mann Whitney U Test would confirm that. As we have come to expect, the group which rejects the null hypothesis most frequently is that of the counselor educators, whose distribution agrees in only one instance. Superintendents reject the null hypothesis 5 times and directors and principals each reject it 3 times. This is also what we would expect from our examination of means and of the tallies. Generally the principals and directors agree more frequently with the counselors than do the other two groups.

Outside Agencies and Community - What Should Be: The means of the responses of the various groups to the set of items under "outside agencies and community" are listed in Table 2:13 below.

Table 2:13
Outside Agencies and Community
What Should Be
Table of Means

Item	Coun.	Prin.	Dir.	Supt.	Educ.	Totals
a	4.36	4.26	4.47	4.10	3.00	4.04
b	4.32	3.87	4.30	4.10	2.67	3.85
c	3.90	3.84	3.53	4.10	2.33	3.56
d	3.75	3.48	3.79	4.10	2.50	3.52
e	3.09	4.09	4.03	4.40	2.50	3.62

Superintendents rate all of the counselors' work with outside agencies and communities as of a very important nature while counselors tend to rank these items as at least moderately important and on items a and b, "refer children for special services" and "provide information to outside agencies upon request," very important. They list as least important, although still highly important, acting "as liaison for parents to outside agencies." Counselor educators consider only 1 of the counselor functions with outside agencies and community as, ideally, of at least moderate importance, ranking all but a as of less than moderate importance. They are the only group, incidentally, which ranks any of these functions as of only slight importance. We might note that none of the groups assigns any of the functions to the category of 1.00 or "not important."

Table 2:14 gives the rank order of the means of the five groups involved in the study and thus allows us to examine more closely the order in which they place the 5 functions listed for outside agencies and community. All but the superintendent consider the most important function of the counselor in relation to outside agencies and community to be item a, "refer children for special services." The superintendents list item e, "act as liaison for parents to outside agencies," as of number 1 importance. Principals consider public relations of least importance while all groups rank that

in the 50th percentile or less. No group agrees with the counselors more than 3 times with only the directors agreeing that frequently.

Table 2:14
Outside Agencies and Community
What Should Be
Rank Order of Means

Item	Coun.	Prin.	Dir.	Supt.	Educ.	Total
a	1	1	1	3.5	1	1
b	2	3	2	3.5	2	2
c	3	4	5	3.5	5	4
d	4	5	4	3.5	3.5	5
e	5	2	3	1	3.5	3

Table 2:15 shows the values of p for the Mann Whitney U Test of these responses.

Table 2:15
MANN-WHITNEY U TEST
Outside Agencies and Community
What Should Be
Values of p*

Item	Prin.	Coun.	Supt.	Educ.
a	.421	.210	.155	.133
b	.210	.210	.111	.028
c	.048	.004	.048	.012
d	.155	.111	.075	.006
e	.111	.155	.075	.028

*Values of p significant at .05 level or below.

Thirteen times out of 20 we are required to accept the null hypothesis on our evaluation and analysis of Part I, E -- should be. Only item c consistently rejects the null hypothesis. For all groups except the educators item c is the only item for which we must reject the null hypothesis. The educators, however, differ in the distribution of their responses with those of the counselor in four out of five cases. Thus in most instances we must conclude that the variance in the distribution of the responses to this part of the questionnaire is no more than might be attributable to chance.

Counselor Responses - The Friedman: Using the Friedman Two-Way Analysis of Variance there are two ways in which we can examine the results of the Test. First we can examine the comparison between each group's responses to "what is" and "what should be" for all of the items in Part I. Second, we can examine the results on the Friedman Test in a comparison of each group to one another for each particular part of Part 1, parts A, B, C, D, and E. Let us begin by examining the counselors results on the Friedman Test as we compare the p (level of significance) for each of the 5 categories of Part I. Table 3:1 explores these relationships. The null hypothesis for the Friedman Two-Way Analysis of Variance might be restated in terms of the counselor functions to state that the responses to the counselors' views of their actual roles as indicated by their responses to "what is" have the same distribution as their views of their ideal roles as indicated by their responses to "what should be." In view of this null hypothesis we would have a significant difference of p of less than .05 and in such cases we would reject the null hypothesis.

Table 3:1
Friedman Two-Way Analysis of Variance
Group: Elementary Guidance Counselors
Value of p*

Item	Child	Parent	Teacher	Admin.	Agen. & Commun.
a	$= .458$	$>.792$	$>.167$	$<.05$	$<.05$
b	$= .375$	$<.05$	$<.05$	$<.05$	$<.05$
c	$>.063$	$<.05$	$<.05$	$<.05$	$>.792$
d	$<.05$	$<.05$	$<.05$	$<.05$	$<.05$
e	$<.05$	$<.05$	$>.542$	$<.05$	$<.05$
f	$<.05$	$<.05$	$>.625$	$>.208$	
g	$<.05$	$>.625$	$<.05$	$<.05$	
h	$<.05$	$<.05$	$<.05$	$<.05$	
i	$<.05$	$<.05$	$<.05$		
j	$<.05$				

*Values of p significant at .05 level or below.

With these conditions in mind, we can see from our examination of Table 3:1 that the null hypothesis is accepted only 10 times out of a possible 41 times. In 31 cases, then, we must reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternate hypothesis that the view of the actual and the ideal roles of the counselor are significantly different. One way to examine the results of the Friedman is to look at the tallies. For example, under "child" item a, the p value is .458; we must accept the null hypothesis; consequently we would not expect any more than chance variance in distribution of responses.

What is: 1:14 2:23 3:22 4:11 5:8
What Should be: 1:5 2:6 3:25 4:24 5:18

We can see that the skew is to the right on the "What is" row and to the left on the "What should be" row, but the distribution is essentially the same, despite the mirror effect. In item d under "child" we reject the null hypothesis.

What is: 1:27 2:22 3:19 4:7 5:1
What Should be: 1:22 2:14 3:27 4:10 5:3

Here we see that responses under "what is" have a left upward movement while responses under "what should be" have a peak at 1 and a higher one at 3; the movement is right upward through rank 3. The table indicates that counselors do not feel that what they actually do in the schools is what they should be doing. They rank as receiving the wrong degree of emphasis in their actual role the following: 7 functions under "parent;" 6 functions under "teacher;" 7 functions under administration; and 3 functions under outside agencies and community. In percentages all of these figures represent more than half of their actual functions. A look back at the Table of Rank Order of Means will support this concept. For example, if we look back at Tables 1:2 and 2:2 where we find the Rank Order of Means for the "Child-What Is" and the "Child-What

Should Be", we note that there is a great deal of shifting of ranks as indicated by the means of the responses of the counselors to items a - j on Part A of Part I. Only items ranked 1, 5, 6 and 10 remain the same. There is a rather drastic shifting of items a and b which move from 7 and 4 respectively on "what is" to 4 and 7 respectively on "what should be." The point of inclusion of this information here is simply to point out that an examination of previous information supports the information provided by the Friedman Two-Way Analysis of Variance and helps to clarify the exact nature of that variance.

Table 3:2
Friedman Two-Way Analysis of Variance
Group: Directors of Guidance
Value of p*

Item	Child	Parent	Teacher	Admin.	Agen. & Commun.
a	$= .458$	$<.05$	$<.05$	$<.05$	$<.05$
b	$<.05$	$<.05$	$<.05$	$<.05$	$<.05$
c	$<.05$	$<.05$	$<.05$	$<.05$	$= .208$
d	$<.05$	$<.05$	$<.05$	$>.063$	$>.167$
e	$<.05$	$<.05$	$>.208$	$<.05$	$<.05$
f	$<.05$	$<.05$	$>.542$	$<.05$	
g	$= .208$	$>.208$	$<.05$	$<.05$	
h	$>.063$	$<.05$	$<.05$	$<.05$	
i	$<.05$	$>.458$	$>.958$		
j	$<.05$				

*Value of p significant at .05 level or below.

Again we see that there is a great tendency to reject the null hypothesis. In fact in 30 of the 41 cases, we must do so, only accepting the null hypothesis in 11 of the cases. We note that we can accept the null hypothesis only once under the items in the administration section; only twice for parent functions and for agencies and community functions and only three times for the other two groups of functions. This table indicates that directors generally envision the elementary guidance counselors functions as ideally quite different from what they actually are.

Table 3:3
Friedman Two-Way Analysis of Variance
Group: Counselor Educators
Value of p*

Item	Child	Parent	Teacher	Admin.	Agen. & Com.
a	<.05	= .834	>.208	>.792	>.208
b	<.05	= .458	<.05	<.05	= .458
c	>.458	= .834	>.375	= .208	>.958
d	<.05	= .834	<.05	= .208	>.167
e	<.05	>.208	>.542	= .208	>.792
f	>.542	>.792	>.792	<.05	
g	= 1.000	>.792	= .208	<.05	
h	>.958	= .458	= .458	>.542	
i	<.05	= .834	>.958		
j	= .834				

*Value of p significant at .05 level or below.

By looking at both tables 3:1 and 3:2 we could compare the degree of similarity or difference between counselors and directors in their acceptance or rejection of each item but we will use tables 3:6 through 3:10 to do this for more clarity, and we will compare all groups with one another in their responses on those tables. We are immediately struck by the fact that there is much more tendency to accept the null hypothesis on the responses to the various items by the counselor educators. In fact, their responses indicate an acceptance of the null hypothesis 31 out of 41 times. We can examine two sets of tallies to see exactly where the difference seems to lie and where the likeness occurs. For one which accepts the null hypothesis, let us look at the tallies of responses for question _a_ under administration.

What is: 1:0 2:2 3:1 4:2 5:1
What should be: 1:3 2:2 3:1 4:0 5:1

We note that in this case there is a spread between 2 and 5 on the "what is" responses and a spread from 1 to 5 on the "what should be" with exactly 1/6 falling at the central point or 3. We might contrast this distribution with that for item _b_ under administration, where we find that we must reject the null hypothesis.

What is: 1:1 2:1 3:4 4:0 5:0
What should be: 1:7 2:0 3:0 4:0 5:0

We note that on the "what is" responses there is a right upward movement through 3. On the "what should be" responses, however, there is a complete drop after 1 so that the pile-up is completely on the left. The difference is visually obvious when we examine these tallies and by doing so, we can attach more meaning to the Friedman Two-Way Analysis results.

In Table 3:4 we shall examine these same responses for the Principals.

Table 3:4
Friedman Two-Way Analysis of Variance
Group: Principals

Item	Child	Parent	Teacher	Admin.	Acen. & Commun.
a	$>.458$	$>.792$	$<.05$	$>.208$	$>.208$
b	$<.05$	$>.458$	$<.05$	$>.167$	$<.05$
c	$>.375$	$>.208$	$>.458$	$>.542$	$>.958$
d	$>.167$	$<.05$	$<.05$	$<.05$	$>.792$
e	$>.458$	$<.05$	$>.458$	$>.958$	$>.208$
f	$<.05$	$<.05$	$>.792$	$>.458$	
g	$>.063$	1.000	$>.208$	$<.05$	
h	$<.05$	$>.958$	$<.05$	$>.958$	
i	$<.05$	$<.05$	$>.208$		
j	$>.063$				

*Value of p significant at .05 level or below.

In 26 cases of the 41 we must accept the null hypothesis, thus stating that the variance of the distribution is no more than can be attributable to chance. For examination, let us look at administration, *e* where the null hypothesis is accepted at a .958 degree of p (probability).

What is: 1:10 2:7 3:5 4:4 5:2
What should be: 1:1 2:2 3:7 4:11 5:9

There is a right downward movement on "what is" and a right upward movement on "what should be." On "what is" there are 17 below the rank of 3 and on "what should be" there are 20 above the rank of 3. We can see that the distribution is reversed and the skews are to the opposite sides. However, the one is a mirror reflection of the other and the null hypothesis is accepted, with the assumption statistically being that the variance in the distribution is a matter of chance.

Table 3:5
Friedman Two-Way Analysis of Variance
Group: Superintendents
Value of p*

Item	Child	Parent	Teacher	Admin.	Agen. & Commun.
a	$>.063$	$<.05$	$<.05$	$<.05$	$<.05$
b	$=.208$	$<.05$	$>.208$	$<.05$	$<.05$
c	$<.05$	$<.05$	$<.05$	$<.05$	$<.05$
d	$<.05$	$<.05$	$<.05$	$<.05$	$<.05$
e	$<.05$	$<.05$	$<.05$	$<.05$	$<.05$
f	$<.05$	$<.05$	$<.05$	$<.05$	
g	$<.05$	$>.208$	$<.05$	$<.05$	
h	$=.458$	$<.05$	$<.05$	.208	
i	$<.05$	$>.542$	$<.05$		
j	$>.067$				

*Value of p significant at .05 level or below.

Again we see that in 7 cases we must accept the null hypothesis but that in 34 cases we must reject it. We would assume from these figures that Superintendents generally feel that counselors' actual functions are not what they should be in an ideal situation. A look at Tables 1:14 and 2:14 should bear out these figures. By turning to them, we note that superintendents ranked items on "what is" in relation to outside agencies and the community in the following order: a:3, b:1.5, c:4, d:5, and e:1.5. On "what should be" they ranked in the following order: a:315, b:3.5, c:3.5, d:3.5 and e:1. We can see that whereas they ranked actual functions *b* and *e* as tied for first place, they ranked ideal function e as *1*. Where they ranked items *a*, *c* and *d* in third, fourth and fifth positions of importance, they recommended items *a*, *b*, *c*, *d*, in tied positions of importance only second to item *e*. Thus they have a great difference between their view of the actual functions of the counselor and their view of the ideal functions in relation to outside agencies and community.

By examining all five of our sample groups together we can compare the degree of difference in their responses to each section of Part I. Table 3:6 lists the p values derived from the Friedman Two-Way Analysis of Variance for all five groups on the items under section A, Child.

Table 3:6
Friedman Two-Way Analysis of Variance
Item Analysis, Part A-Child
Value of p*

Item	Coun.	Prin.	Dir.	Supt.	Educ.
a	$= .458$	$>.458$	$=.458$	$>.063$	$<.05$
b	$= .375$	$<.05$	$<.05$	$=.208$	$<.05$
c	$>.063$	$>.375$	$<.05$	$<.05$	$>.458$
d	$<.05$	$>.167$	$<.05$	$<.05$	$<.05$
e	$<.05$	$>.458$	$<.05$	$<.05$	$<.05$
f	$<.05$	$<.05$	$<.05$	$<.05$	$>.542$
g	$<.05$	$>.063$	.208	$<.05$	$= 1.000$
h	$<.05$	$<.05$	$>.063$	$= .458$	$>.958$
i	$<.05$	$<.05$	$<.05$	$<.05$	$<.05$
j	$<.05$	$>.063$	$<.05$	$>.167$	$>.834$

*Value of p significant at .05 level or below.

We see that counselors and directors most often see the ideal function of the counselor as quite different from the actual function, as revealed by the fact that both groups reject the null hypothesis 7 out of 10 times. Superintendents reject the null hypothesis 6 out of 10 times; educators 5 times and principals 4 times. This means that principals accept the null hypothesis 6 times, or in other words that in three-fifths of the cases they are satisfied that the counselor's actual role is the same as his ideal role. All other groups feel that in at least half of his functions within his role he is not performing the ideal functions or at least not giving them the proper degree of stress.

Table 3:7
Friedman Two-Way Analysis of Variance
Item Analysis, Part B-Parent
Value of p*

Item	Coun.	Prin.	Dir.	Supt	Educ.
a	>.792	>.792	<.05	<.05	=.834
b	<.05	>.458	<.05	<.05	=.458
c	<.05	>.208	<.05	<.05	=.834
d	<.05	<.05	<.05	<.05	=.834
e	<.05	<.05	<.05	<.05	>.208
f	<.05	<.05	<.05	<.05	>.792
g	>.625	=1.000	>.208	>.208	>.792
h	<.05	>.958	<.05	<.05	=.458
i	<.05	<.05	>.458	>.542	=.834

*Value of p significant at .05 level or below.

We can see that all groups were most happy with the amount of stress placed on item *g*, "conduct group counseling." On the basis of our other tables and the statistical analyses they represent, we can further state that all groups see this function as given little stress in the schools and recommend that it continue to receive little stress. Educators tend to accept all of the functions in relation to the parent as approximating the ideal. The other four groups, however, are displeased with the amount of emphasis placed on items *d*, e and f and either feel that there should be more or less emphasis placed on them. Question s of Part II asks the responderts to write in the rank placement of counselor functions and thus attempts to probe more fully the degrees of stress although an analysis of the tallies can give much of the same information. For example by looking at item f, "individual counseling," we discover that all four groups believe that individual counseling of parents should receive greater emphasis in an ideal counselor role.

Table 3:8
Friedman Two-Way Analysis of Variance
Item Analysis, Part C-Teacher
Value of p*

Item	Coun.	Prin.	Dir.	Supt.	Educ.
a	>.167	<.05	<.05	<.05	>.208
b	<.05	<.05	<.05	>.208	<.05
c	<.05	>.458	<.05	<.05	>.375
d	<.05	<.05	<.05	<.05	<.05
e	>.542	>.458	>.208	<.05	>.542
f	>.625	>.792	>.542	<.05	>.792
g	<.05	>.208	<.05	<.05	>.208
h	<.05	<.05	<.05	<.05	.458
i	<.05	>.208	>.958	<.05	>.958

*Value of p significant at .05 level or below.

On Table 3:8 we see that in no case do all five groups accept the null hypothesis. On two items, e and f all groups except the Superintendents accept the null hypothesis. This means that the difference in the variance of their distributions between what is and what should be in relation to the teacher is similar enough so that any variance can be attributed to chance. Overall the general tendency, however, is to reject the null hypothesis for most items thus showing that all five groups frequently feel that the actual functions of the counselor in relation to teachers are not receiving the proper degree of emphasis. This statement is not true, however, for the educators, who, as previous tables have shown, tend most frequently to accept the null hypothesis. They tend, in other words, to consider the actual functions of the counselor as being close to the ideal functions in relation to teachers. We see that principals most frequently accept the null hypothesis, accepting it all but 2 times; that educators accept the null hypothesis all but 3 times and that all other groups tend to reject the null hypothesis most of the time. We have come to expect this response from educators. Principals, however, here indicate that in general they are satisfied that the actual functioning of the guidance counselor in relation to the administration is close to the ideal. Counselors most frequently reject the null hypothesis, indicating that they most often feel that their actual functions in relation to the administration are not close to the ideal and thus are not given the proper degree of emphasis in all but one case where the null hypothesis is accepted. This occurs for item _f_, "provide reports of counselor activities" which they then to accept with an almost equal distribution across the ranks from 1 to 5, thus indicating wide disagreement among counselors on both the actual and the ideal role, and thus showing that any variance between distribution of the two is due to chance.

Table 3:9
Friedman Two-Way Analysis of Variance
Item Analysis: Part D-Administration
Value of p*

Item	Coun.	Prin.	Dir.	Supt.	Educ.
a	<.05	>.208	<.05	<.05	>.792
b	<.05	>.167	<.05	<.05	<.05
c	<.05	>.542	<.05	<.05	=.208
d	<.05	<.05	>.063	<.05	=.208
e	<.05	>.958	<.05	<.05	=.208
f	>.208	>.458	<.05	<.05	<.05
g	<.05	<.05	<.05	<.05	<.05
h	<.05	>.958	<.05	=.208	>.542

*Value of p significant at .05 level or below.

Table e:10 shows the responses of all groups according to the values of p based on the Friedman Two-Way Analysis of Variance in the relation of counselors to agencies and community. In every case educators accept the null hypothesis; in three cases principals accept the null hypothesis; in two cases the directors accept it; in one case the counselor does and in no cases does the superintendent group. We must assume that superintendents see a need for change of emphasis in all areas of counselor-agency and community relations but that in no case do educators see a need for a change of emphasis in these areas. Counselors tend to agree more closely with superintendents than they do with educators, since they disagree with superintendents only on item c, "do follow up studies." By looking at the tallies we can see that counselors see a much stronger need for increased emphasis in this area since they increase the mean rating by 1.15 while superintendents increase it only by 66.

Table 3:10
Friedman Two-Way Analysis of Variance
Item Analysis: Part A-Agencies and Community
Value of p*

Item	Coun.	Prin.	Dir.	Supt.	Educ.
a	$<.05$	$>.208$	$<.05$	$<.05$	$>.208$
b	$<.05$	$<.05$	$<.05$	$<.05$	$>.458$
c	$>.792$	$>.958$	$=.208$	$<.05$	$>.958$
d	$<.05$	$>.792$	$>.167$	$<.05$	$>.167$
e	$<.05$	$>.208$	$<.05$	$<.05$	$>.792$

*Values of p significant at .05 level or below.

Questionnaire Part II

Li~~c~~kert-type scales: In Part II questions a through p, the Li~~c~~kert-type scales, the items are not interdependent. In some cases, in fact, they are mutually exclusive. For example where a respondent indicated that he feels that state certification requirements should be revised, he would not also indicate that they should be eliminated, since the two responses show an opposite attitude toward certification. For this reason, Part II can not be analyzed in exactly the same way as was Part I. The same statistical instruments, the establishment of the mean and the establishment of the value of p in the Mann-Whitney U Test, have been used, but the table of ranks of means has been omitted because ranking is not relevant to these items. We can, by looking at the Table of Means, 4:1, evaluate the responses of the various groups to each of the questions concerning educational training, certification and desirable concommitant activities for the elementary guidance counselor.

Table 4:1, which follows, shows us that all groups overwhelmingly feel that revision of state certification requirements for elementary guidance counselors, item a, is necessary. The mean for each sample is in at least the "moderately important" category of 3.00 or higher. For the superintendents and educators the mean is over 4.00 or in the "very important" category of response. By looking at the responses to item b, eliminate certification, we can see that all groups rank this within the 1.00 to 2.00 degree of importance,

or as "not important." Items c and d can also be compared. Item c states that elementary guidance counselors should have a broad liberal arts education; item d states that they should have a broad behavioral science education. We can see by examining the means, that the responses are only slightly higher for item d and that responses are very mixed, with c generally having a mean of more than 3.00 or "moderately important," and d having a mean of more than 4.00 or "very important." Educators, we note, favor a behavioral science education for counselors, with a mean response of 4.12 as opposed to a mean response of 2.75 to broad liberal arts education. Both directors and superintendents as well as principals favor a broad behavioral science background although the number of "moderately important" rankings for a broad liberal arts education are significant of some disagreement among all these groups. The same is true for counselors who rank both in the 3.00 to 4.00 range. Of items e, f and g, counselor educators rank as very important item f, "strong psychology background," and item g, "strong guidance background," but consider "strong elementary education preparation," item e of only slight importance. All other groups rate preparation in elementary education of at least moderate importance, with elementary school principals rating it highest, almost into the range of "very important" with a 3.94 mean. All groups rate a strong psychology background as "very important" and all but directors consider a strong guidance background as "very important." They, however, consider it of high moderate importance with a mean of 3.88.

Table 4:1
Education and Certification
Table of Means

Item	Coun.	Prin.	Dir.	Supt.	Educ.	Total
a	3.92	3.45	3.97	4.30	4.50	4.05
b	1.32	1.83	1.48	1.50	1.12	1.72
c	3.03	3.36	3.26	3.20	2.75	3.12
d	3.95	4.39	4.17	4.40	4.12	4.21
e	3.37	3.94	3.20	3.50	2.87	3.38
f	4.29	4.23	4.20	4.50	4.00	4.24
g	4.01	4.19	3.88	4.40	4.12	4.12
h	3.27	3.71	3.17	3.90	3.87	3.58
i	3.93	3.84	3.83	4.10	4.50	4.04
j	3.72	3.67	3.08	3.50	2.62	3.32
k	4.06	4.29	3.91	4.20	4.50	4.19
l	3.62	3.74	3.43	3.50	3.12	3.48
m	4.14	3.94	4.08	3.40	4.25	3.92
n	3.27	3.07	3.68	3.40	4.25	3.52
o	4.15	3.71	4.45	3.40	4.12	3.77
p	3.87	4.09	4.11	4.30	3.87	4.05

All groups feel that a knowledge of research and statistics, item h, is at least moderately important with a range of means from 3.17 to 3.90. All groups also rate preparation for parent counseling, item _i_, as at least moderately important and two groups rank it as very important: superintendents and educators. We see a wide range of response, almost 1.00, in answer to item _j_, "experience in classroom teaching." Educators tend to feel that such experience is only slightly important while counselors themselves feel that it is moderately important and close to being very important. Principals agree with counselors on this question. Directors are approximately halfway between counselors and educators in their response, but still rank it as moderately important. "An internship in elementary guidance" receives a mean response of "very important" from all groups except directors, who rank item _k_ as very close to that degree of importance. Psychometric training, item _l_, is seen as of less importance although it still is moderately important to the elementary guidance counselor's training. Of all five groups, only those least directly involved in the actual guidance functions in the school -- the principals and the superintendents -- rate item _m_ as only moderately important. Both the counselor and the director of guidance, as well as the counselor educator, deem very important this item, the ability of the counselor to have flexibility in determining his functions. It must be admitted, however, that even a mean of "moderately important" is high on the scale and thus we might conclude that all groups generally feel that counselors need to have flexibility, being free to enact whatever functions seem to them as most important at any particular time. All groups also felt that it was at least moderately important for counselors to belong to area and state counselor organizations, item n, and that they should participate in professional improvement activities, item p. In fact three groups rated p and one group rated n "very important." Three groups also rated a "master's degree minimum" item o as very important while two groups rated it moderately important. Counselors, directors and educators all feel it is very important and principals and superintendents feel it is moderately important.

The values of p obtained from the Mann-Whitney U Test allow us to take a closer look at the distribution of responses of the five sample populations to the questions we have been discussing. Table 4:2 lists these values for all groups, giving the value as compared to the responses by the counselors themselves to each item. The Mann-Whitney U Test tests the null hypothesis that groups A and B have the same distribution and therefore come from the same or like populations. In each case the counselor sample represents one group and each of the other groups represent in turn the other group being compared by the test. If we look at Table 4:2 we can see that counselors and principals had a distribution similar enough so that any variance was attributable to chance all but two times. This means that in all but two cases we must accept the null hypothesis. Only for items _c_ and _h_ can we reject the null hypothesis, for there the values of p are less than .05 and thus indicate that the null hypothesis must be rejected. Essentially, then, we can say that the results of the Mann-Whitney U Test indicate that principals and counselors are generally in fair agreement concerning the items in Part II of the questionnaire and that any differences among them are no more than might be attributable to chance. The same is essentially true of the directors where we find that we can reject the null hypothesis only two times again, here on questions _c_ and _e_. Superintendents and counselors tend to agree on all but 10 items, which means that they agree on 6 items. Thus we find that there is generally disagreement between the counselors and superintendents in the distribution of their responses to various items in Part II. We might note that their distribution of responses is similar on questions pertaining to elimination of state certification requirements, strong psychology background, strong guidance background, educational preparation for parent counseling, flexibility in determining functions, and participation in professional improvement activities. Educators' and counselors' responses have approximately the same distribution of responses only twice, we note -- on items _b_ and _f_. Otherwise they differ significantly in the distribution of their responses and can not be said to have come from the same or like populations. We have noted that this disagreement between counselor educators and counselors is consistent throughout the items of the questionnaire; as we have also noted that there is a general tendency for counselors and directors of guidance to agree.

Table 4:2
MANN-WHITNEY U TEST
Education and Certification
Value of p*

Item	Prin.	Dir.	Supt.	Educ.
a	.183	.183	.048	.016
b	.133	.274	.210	.061
c	.006	.038	.004	.004
d	.155	.111	.016	.022
e	.075	.038	.028	.004
f	.274	.242	.155	.075
g	.111	.111	.111	.022
h	.028	.075	.012	.004
i	.183	.111	.111	.048
j	.075	.155	.008	.004
k	.155	.133	.022	.028
l	.061	.111	.128	.012
m	.155	.133	.093	.038
n	.038	.093	.016	.004
o	.183	.210	.133	.028
p	.111	.111	.048	.016

*Value of p significant at .05 level or below.

Open-ended questions: In order to allow respondents to express themselves more freely and to gather more specific data for the study, three open-ended questions were used in Part II. Question q asked for a response to the following: "List below the courses you feel should be required for elementary counselor preparation." The number of times that a course was mentioned was tallied and all courses mentioned were noted. Table 4:3 lists the courses mentioned and the number of times that they were mentioned by each group with a column of totals. C designates counselors; P-principals; D-directors; S-superintendents and E-counselor educators.

Table 4:3
Required Courses for Counselors
Part II: question q

Course	C	P	D	S	E	Total
Child Development and Psychology	56	10	18	3	7	94
Introductory Psychology	13	8	3	2	0	26
Adolescent Psychology	14	4	4	0	0	22
Abnormal Psychology	52	7	10	5	5	79
Educational Psychology	17	7	5	0	6	35
Individual Testing	62	7	21	3	7	100
Group Testing	45	7	19	2	7	80
Tests and Measurements	14	1	0	0	0	15
Introduction to Guidance	35	8	5	2	0	50
Research and Statistics	19	4	12	3	1	39
Sociology	8	3	6	1	4	22

Course	C	P	D	S	E	Total
Sensitivity training	11	3	9	5	4	32
Group Counseling	61	7	17	1	6	92
Individual Counseling	52	7	19	1	5	84
Counseling Internship	23	0	7	0	1	31
Practicum	23	2	8	1	4	39
Reading Problems	6	0	1	0	1	8
Learning Disabilities	32	0	10	1	1	44
Theories of Personality	18	0	1	1	4	24
Family Counseling	22	5	6	0	0	33
Emotionally Disturbed	12	0	0	0	0	12
Play Therapy	13	0	1	0	0	14
Behavior Modification	10	0	2	1	0	13
Case Study	12	0	0	0	0	12
Occupational Information	13	3	3	0	5	24
Counseling Theories	0	0	0	3	3	6
Community Resources	3	1	2	1	0	7
Projective Techniques	2	0	0	0	1	3
Mental Health	5	0	0	1	0	6
Learning Theory	11	5	2	1	1	20
Consultation	2	0	0	0	0	2
Philosophy of Education	0	3	5	1	0	9
School Law	2	1	0	0	0	3
Educational Testing	0	0	0	0	3	3
Drug Education	0	0	0	0	1	1

The most frequently mentioned courses, with a number of mentions of greater than 80, are Individual Testing, Child Development and Psychology, Group Testing, Individual Counseling and, with 79 mentions, Abnormal Psychology. From the number of mentions we can see that the responses to questions d and f of Part II are substantiated by the responses to question g. Psychology is especially stressed and the behavioral sciences are most frequently mentioned among the courses listed. The whole area of testing receives frequent mention also. Some of the newer courses, such as sensitivity training, Behavior modification, family counseling, learning disabilities and drug education are mentioned particularly by counselors, directors and educators -- those probably most involved with counselor courses. Principals, directors and superintendents show a slight concern for Philosophy of Education while counselors and counselor educators completely overlook this course. There is perhaps some overlap among the courses which would explain why some groups mentioned some courses and others did not. For example, counseling theories were mentioned only by superintendents and educators. Such theories, however, might be thought by other groups to be covered sufficiently in Introductory Guidance or Testing courses. Learning theory, which is only mentioned 20 times, might be thought by many to be adequately discussed in courses such as Child Development or Educational Psychology. Internship in elementary guidance, which is rated in question k, is mentioned under q only 31 times, a comparatively small number of times. On the other hand, the next question, question r, asks what changes should be made in State requirements for certification. A number of persons felt that an internship in guidance should be mandatory and some suggested that it should be required in lieu of elementary teaching experience. Thus we can not get an adequate concept of the real attitude toward internships by looking at the responses to question q alone. The same thing is true of the counseling practicum which is frequently mentioned in question r but is mentioned under question q only 39 times, not a high number of times compared to a course in Group Testing, for example. Table 4:4 documents the responses to question r: "List any important changes you feel should be made in State certification laws in Massachusetts." Respondents were given five blanks in which to write suggested changes. A major controversy in the Massachusetts State Department of Education in this year 1971-72 is the controversy over counselor certification. Currently counselors are required to have teacher certification. We can see that a number of our respondents wished to express their views concerning this requirement since it is a major issue in the controversy. Thus we have 30 persons maintaining that teacher certification should be required for counselor education and 22 persons maintaining that it should not. Counselor educators and superintendents, we note, more frequently expressed a view against teacher certification while the other three groups more frequently expressed approval of it. Thirteen persons felt that there should be no certification whatsoever and 9 persons, all drawn from the counselor and counselor educator groups, felt that colleges should be responsible for certifying counselors. The requirement of an internship in guidance and a master's degree in guidance before certification drew the two highest responses. Twenty-five felt that course requirements for certification should be more rigid; 2 said they should be less rigid. Thirteen respondents, most notably directors, suggested that there should be a probation period for counselors before certification in granted. As we might expect from the responses to both items g and f, a number of counselors recommended the addition of more psychology courses for certification. The same number recommended adding a course in learning disabilities as a requirement. An important aspect of guidance, and one which has received a lot of attention in recent research, was mentioned by 4 respondents: that is to make certification regulations so that they differentiate between elementary and secondary counselors.

Table 4:4
Counselor Certification
Question r

Change	C	P	D	S	E	Total
Require teacher certification	17	5	5	2	1	30
No teacher certification	11	1	2	5	3	22
No certification	4	1	2	5	1	13
Colleges should certify	6	0	0	0	3	9
Eliminate waivers	1	0	1	0	0	2
Require practicum	12	6	5	0	0	23
Require internship/guidance	18	12	6	1	1	38
Master's degree	17	2	12	2	3	36
Omit occupational information	6	0	0	0	0	6
More rigid course requirements	20	1	4	0	0	25
Less rigid course requirements	0	0	0	1	1	2
Probation period	2	1	10	0	0	13
More psychology courses	12	0	1	0	0	13
Follow MASCA recommendations	0	0	0	1	1	2
Differentiate between elementary and secondary	2	1	1	0	0	4
Learning disabilities course	12	0	0	0	0	12

Table 4:5 analyzes the responses to question s: "List in rank order what you consider the necessary functions of the elementary guidance counselor." The numbers under each group represent the mean of the responses of each group, using 1 as

rank 1, the highest, so that the larger the number, the lower the rank given to it. The chart does not reflect the number of times that each response was given; therefore this information is added in Table 4:7 since frequency is related to degree of importance.

Table 4:5
Means of Counselor Functions
Question s

Functions Related to:	Coun.	Prin.	Dir.	Supt.	Educ.
Children	1.23	1.00	1.29	1.33	2.36
Parents	2.72	2.47	2.28	3.00	2.00
Teachers	2.60	2.08	2.29	2.55	1.37
Administrators	2.85	3.25	3.27	4.00	1.66
Agencies/Community	3.62	4.00	3.60	4.25	4.22
Testing	3.00	3.33	3.64	2.50	2.75
Research	3.40	2.00	4.50	5.00	2.75
In-Service Teaching	3.13	4.00	----	4.00	3.50
Records	4.25	3.00	3.75	----	----
Elementary curriculum	3.50	3.00	----	----	5.00

We notice that all groups except the counselor educators rank services directly to children as of first importance. Educators rate highest services to teachers and administrators. Parents and teachers generally run in second and third position and the means indicate that services to them are almost equally important to the four groups who actually function within the elementary school. Interestingly, everyone ranks the administration higher than the top administrators do, with counselors averaging between 2 and 3 in ranking them, while superintendents themselves tend to agree on fourth position. We note that educators rank them a close second to teachers. Of the top five functions we find that each group ranks in the following order:

Table 4:6
Counselor Functions
Rank Order of Means
Question s

Functions Related to:	Coun.	Prin.	Dir.	Supt.	Educ.
Children	1	1	1	1	4
Parents	3	3	2	3	3
Teachers	2	2	3	2	1
Administrators	4	4	4	4	2
Agencies/Community	5	5	5	5	5

Thus all groups see the counselors' services to agencies and the community as only of fifth importance to the role. All persons in the school itself agree on the most important as the child and the fourth important the administration functions and there is some disagreement between those considered of second and third importance. It is interesting to note that educators' views, as we have been led to expect from their previous answers to the questionnaire, disagree in almost all cases.

Table 4:7
Counselor Functions
Response Frequency
Question s

Functions Related to:	Coun.	Prin.	Dir.	Supt.	Educ.
Children	70	20	24	9	8
Parents	28	15	22	7	8
Teachers	63	13	22	9	8
Administrators	20	4	11	4	6
Agencies/Community	39	8	10	4	4
Testing	33	9	11	4	4
Research	5	2	4	1	4
In-Service Teaching	8	1	0	1	2
Records	4	2	4	0	0
Elementary curriculum	15	1	0	0	1

Only a scattering of persons listed such items as research and in-service teaching in answer to question _s_. By in-service teaching, most clarified this phrase to mean teaching teachers how to work with children with various kinds of disabilities by means of workshops. A number of counselors mentioned elementary curriculum, specifying such things as scheduling as a clarification of their meaning. We can observe that many persons did not list five functions but rather listed only 2 or 3 and in some cases only 1 which they considered important. Most frequently counselors who mentioned only 1 mentioned counseling children. This, in fact, was noted most frequently by all groups, and reinforces the response to Part I, A, item e, "counseling individuals and groups" where this item was ranked of first importance by most groups (see Tables 1:1 and 1:2).

Questionnaire Part III

The most unpopular part of the questionnaire was part III, the Semantic differential scales. Apparently this type of test was a new experience for many of the respondents because a number of them refused to answer it, some even indicating their displeasure with such written comments as "Ridiculous!" "stupid" "You're wasting my time." To give an idea of the amount of hostility to these scales we can consider the number of those who did respond to them in comparison to the number of returns received. Table 5:1 gives this information.

Table 5:1
Semantic Differential Scales
Responses

	Coun.	Prin.	Dir.	Supt.	Educ.	Total
Questionnaire Returns	79	33	34	20	8	174
Part III Responses	71	27	24	14	6	142

Approximately 8% were hostile to the scales and did not do any of them. Of those shown in table 5:1 10 did not complete the scales. The Semantic Differential does not attempt to obtain a response concerning a counselor's functions, education or certification. Rather, it attempts to elicit an image of the counselor role as it relates to the elementary school's functions. For this reason, it was coupled with scales pertaining to the elementary school principal. The study is not concerned with the response to the principal, however. That role was used merely to provide a basis for comparison by the respondents and was placed first in order to allow them to gain experience with the use of the scale with the assumption that this practice would make their responses to the counselor role more valid. As we have noted in chapter III only 8 items were of interest to this particular study, the others acting as fillers. All 8 of these items are evaluative ones and thus are not concerned with such factors as activity or potency in relation to the counselor's role. Table 5:2 summarizes the means for the responses of all groups. Respondents were asked to place a X in the space which most nearly represented their attitude toward each set of bi-polar scales. In the analysis of these scales, the scales were numbered 1 through 7 with 1 the lowest rating and 7 the highest. The scales were randomly mixed throughout the 16 sets, so that the 8 to be evaluated were dispersed throughout the test and the poles were interchanged at random. Thus the words had to be read before a judgment could be made. Since 7.00 would be the highest possible attainable score, ratings over 3.50 would be favorable responses. Ratings as high as any of those on this scale are very high where the lowest mean is a 5.2 given by educators in response to the fair-unfair scale. Some responses we note are over six. Generally counselors and directors rate over 6.00, both giving only one rating of less than six. All of the principals' ratings have a mean in the 5.00 to 5.99 range as do all of the educators'. Superintendents give a mean rating of 4 in the 5 range and 4 in the 6 range. This information leads us to the conclusion that all groups have a very favorable image of the elementary counselor's role, which is verified statistically by the F test of variance a parametric test which analyzes variance

Table 5:2
Semantic Differential Scales
Table of Means

Bi-polar scales	Coun.	Prin.	Dir.	Supt.	Educ.	Total
1. unpleasant-pleasant	6.1	5.7	6.2	6.0	5.8	5.9
4. honest-dishonest	6.1	5.8	6.1	5.9	5.8	5.9
6. clean-dirty	6.3	5.7	6.4	6.1	6.3	6.1
7. kind-cruel	6.3	5.9	6.3	5.9	5.8	6.0
9. bad-good	6.0	5.5	6.0	6.3	5.3	5.9
11. awful-nice	5.8	5.7	5.5	5.7	5.7	5.7
14. worthless-valuable	6.3	5.7	6.4	6.3	5.7	6.1
16. fair-unfair	6.0	5.7	6.2	5.3	5.2	5.7
Totals	6.1	5.7	6.0	6.2	5.7	5.9

from the mean. Table 5:3 provides this information schematically.

Table 5:3
Semantic Differential Scales
F Test of Variance

Scale	F_{05}	Variance	Standard Deviation	Chance Variance	F
1. unpleasant-pleasant	2.69	.17	1.19	61.8	.019
4. honest-dishonest	2.69	.10	.70	52.0	.010
6. clean-dirty	2.69	.066	.46	65.25	.007
7. kind-cruel	2.69	.464	3.25	64.30	.050
9. bad-good	2.69	.700	4.9	29.90	.095
11. awful-nice	2.69	.05	.35	48.71	.001
14. worthless-valuable	2.69	.49	3.43	79.46	.043
16. fair-unfair	2.69	.75	5.25	51.34	.10

The F test tests the variance from the mean by establishing arithmetically the value of F_{05} or what the F value must be in order for the difference in mean between two or more groups to be significant. The F score is computed by dividing the chance variance into the standard deviation. We note that for all scales in Part III the F_{05} must equal 2.69 in order for the variance from the mean to be meaningful. By looking at the F column we can see that in no case does the F score even come near to being that large. Thus we can see that the variance from the mean on the Semantic Differential scales is not significant for the responses to any of the scales.

Open-ended Question for Counselor Educators

Respondents in the counselor educator group were asked to answer 3 questions additional to the questionnaire. These questions were: 1) Is a program in elementary school counselor preparation offered at your institution? 2) If yes, what degree is offered? 3) List the requirements for attaining the degree. Since all 12 of the educators who received questionnaires teach at colleges or universities which are listed as having elementary counseling programs, it was expected that the answers to question one would all be yes. However, of the 8 respondents, 5 answered yes, 1 answered no and 2 did not answer. We have, therefore, to deal with only 5 responses. Of the 5 who indicated that their college or university does have an elementary counselor program, 4 indicated that they offer a Master of Education (one specified that this was a Master of Education in Counseling); one that they offer a Master of Arts in Psychology and Guidance; one that they offer a C. A. G. S. in Counseling and one that they offer a Ph. D. in Counseling. In answer to question 3, only three listed specific courses. Two were universities and one was a college. One university professor listed the following courses:

Education Foundations
Psychology Foundations
Sociology Foundations
Personnel Services
Counseling
Practicum
Measurement

The second university professor listed these courses:

Research Methods
Foundations of Guidance
Tests and Test Procedures
Vocational and Personal Development in the Elementary School
Counseling Theory and Process I and II
Elementary Counseling Practicum (2 courses)

The college professor listed the following courses:

Principles of Guidance
Psychological Measurement
Principles and Practices of Counseling
Abnormal Psychology
Psychology of Personality
Group Psychology
Psychology of Development

All indicated that these were required courses and that electives made up the other hours necessary for the degrees. We notice that 2 schools require a counseling practicum, as recommended by many of the respondents in Part II, question q. Also one college stresses psychology, which some of the respondents to the questionnaire advocated both in response to question q of Part II and item f of Part II. Also all of them require a course dealing with tests and measurements, and at least one dealing with counseling. These courses, too, were recommended in the open-ended questions of Part II. Apparently none of them require courses in learning disabilities, individual and group testing, sensitivity training nor an internship in guidance. Because of the paucity of the response to the third question, it is difficult to make any meaningful assessment of the counselor programs offered in the state, however.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Review

The position of the elementary school guidance counselor in the State of Massachusetts is one of uncertainty. Already two districts have dropped the position or replaced guidance counselors with adjustment counselors. As other writers and the vice-president of ASCA have pointed out, the new accent on accountability has placed the elementary school counselor in a vulnerable position since it is difficult if not impossible to measure his accomplishments by any set of behavioral objectives. What makes his position even less tenable is the controversy over the exact nature of his role. Who he is to serve and how he is to serve them are questions which are answered in many ways by many people. Moreover, who is to define his role and thus dictate his functions is also a point of conflict. Nor is the problem limited to the elementary school counselor in Massachusetts, for studies mentioned in Chapter II of this paper reveal that his problems are typical of those of counselors throughout the country. One writer pessimistically states that "the continuing controversy in the field of elementary school guidance over the role and functions of the elementary guidance worker may never be resolved."[70] This study has attempted to search out some of the problems in the hope that in the process some causes might surface and with them some solutions. In its attempt to clarify the elementary counselor's role in this State, the study has hypothesized that there is a dichotomy between the real and the perceived role of the counselor, not only in the counselor's perception of himself but also in others' perception of him, and that the perception of the actual role differs from that of the ideal role. The counselor alone does not define his role. As is true for any role, its definition is determined to a great extent by the way other people see it. In elementary schools, the counselor's role is sensitive to the demands of many people, but most of all it is determined by administrators and the counselor, who are, in turn, influenced by counselor educators. Certainly other people, too -- teachers, parents, pupils -- all affect the counselor role. The influence of these others, it was felt, was more subtle than that of those who are responsible for the job description of the counselor. Therefore the study concentrated on an assessment of the counselor role and those aspects of it which most determine its definition: the role functions which the counselor performs, his education for the role, and the requirements for his certification in this State. Thus a total of 343 questionnaires was mailed to five groups comprised of elementary guidance counselors, directors of guidance, elementary principals, superintendents of schools and counselor educators. One hundred and seventy five questionnaires (51%) were returned; 69.9% of counselors; 33.3% of principals; 58.3% of directors; 66.6% of counselor educators and 34% of superintendents. The questionnaire was made up of three parts, one concerned with counselor functions, both actual and ideal; a second related to counselor education and certification, and a third concerned with the image of the elementary counselor role. Counselor educators were sent an additional set of questions related to the programs for elementary guidance offered by their institutions. Three different forms were used on the questionnaire, Likert-type scales, Semantic Differential scales and open-ended questions. Responses to the questionnaires were analyzed by means of several parametric and nonparametric tests, including the Mann-Whitney U Test, the Friedman Two-Way Analysis of Variance, the F Test and the measurements of the mean and the standard deviation. These tests led to a number of conclusions. First of all, they affirmed the hypothesis on which the study is based: there is in fact a dichotomy between the actual and perceived roles of the elementary guidance counselors. The

---

[70] Don Bencher, "Counseling, Consulting, or Developmental Guidance? Toward An Answer," Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, Vol. IV, 4 (May, 1970), 245.

Mann-Whitney U Test allowed a close analysis of the responses of counselors, who indicated the nature and emphasis of their various actual functions, in comparison with the responses of the other groups in regard to what they consider the actual functions. Overall there was much disagreement, not only between the counselor and other groups but also among other groups. Secondly, there is great disagreement among the groups and even within the groups concerning the nature of the ideal role of the counselor. On the other hand, it was discovered that there is a consensus on the image of the counselor role, which is seen as a valuable and highly favored one by all groups. There was, however, considerable disagreement on the kind of educational training an elementary guidance counselor should have and equal disagreement on certification regulations. All of these findings made definition of the counselor role difficult but not impossible, for there were important points of agreement.

Discussion

By reviewing some of the tables in Chapter IV, we can at least approach a definition of the counselor role. The responses to Part III of the questionnaire, where there is strong agreement among all groups, makes it possible for us to convert Table 5:2 to a series of adjectives which describe the counselor role. It is seen by all respondents as pleasant, honest, kind, good, nice, fair, clean and valuable. These words, however, describe, not define. For definition we must turn to Table 1:1, 1:4, 1:7, 1:10 and 1:13 where the means of the responses of all groups are given in a totals column and to the responses to Part II, question _s_, given in Table 4:5, where all groups listed the rank order of functions. Despite great disagreement among and within the groups, the average ranks indicate that the following functions are of most concern overall. Table 4:6 reveals that a counselor is one who functions with children, teacher, parents, administrators and outside agencies and community, in that order. By examining his actual functions with these groups, we can further define. Table 1:1 tells us that the elementary school counselor is one who most importantly identifies special children, interprets test results and counsels both individuals and groups. Table 1:7 reveals that the counselor is one who provides the teacher with test interpretations, information on the child and crisis intervention. Furthermore, he is responsible to the child's parents to consult with them concerning their child, act as a liaison between them and other school personnel, recommend outside agencies when such help is needed and interpret test results to them (Table 1:4). He is one who recommends to the administration group or grade placement of children and participates in workshops (Table 1:10) and one who refers children for special services and provides information on children to outside agencies (Table 1:13). His most important functions in the school, then, as indicated by the average of the means for all groups, are to assess the ability of children, to pass this information on to others, and to attempt to remedy disabilities through counseling, referral or recommendations to teachers, parents or others. By referring to Tables 2:1 to 2:15 we can see that these same two or three major functions maintain position in the top three for the ideal functions of the counselor as indicated by the average of the means of the groups. Thus for the major functions, considering the total sample populations response only, there is a consistency of opinion which defines the counselor role. It must be acknowledged that in Massachusetts the counselor is seen as primarily a remedial agent, whose primary concern is for children identified as "special" for one reason or another. Some of his work might be what could be called "preventive" such as counseling referred children and consulting with parents, but none of his actual work is seen by the total sample populations of this study as developmental in nature. Ideally, however, "discussion with all children," an important function in developmental guidance, is ranked of fourth importance, having moved from a rank of seventh for the actual functions of the counselor. This, plus the increased emphasis recommended for such activities as providing career information and providing educational information to parents, shows an awareness that the guidance program should be more developmental in nature.

The greatest disagreement on the elementary counselor's role was seen between the counselor and the counselor educator. Sylvia B. Rosenthal angrily states that counselor educators are largely to blame for the fact that counselors are not agents of change, that they "adjust the child to fit the existing school program instead of helping adjust the school program to the child."[71] Jackie Lamb, the new vice-president of ASCA, laments the fact that elementary counselors "are considered part of the whole system that maintains the status quo of society and are reproached for not doing [their] share to make the system more favorable for children."[72] The results of this study, however, although they reveal that counselors tend to do what others expect them to do and to feel that their ideal functions are largely the same as the actual, and thus maintain the status quo, do not support Miss Rosenthal's statement; for it is the counselor educators who consistently view the counselor's role as different from the way others see it. In fact, so different are their responses from those of the other groups that we are forced to question the value and relevance of counselor education. Educators, we see, advocate all kinds of courses which encourage experimentation and innovation. They advocate courses which would prepare counselors for a program of developmental guidance. The study found that they suggested such required courses as sensitivity training, individual assessment and psychology of vocational development. The major problem, however, was not their recommendations for the ideal counselor role, but their view of the actual role. They seem to be very out of touch with what actually goes on in the schools. They see elementary counselors as major agents of occupational information, for example, when in fact all school groups see this as of close to least importance in the actual operation of the school counselor. The counselor educators, then, appear to be trying to effect change based on an imperfect assessment of the real situation.

---

[71] Sylvia Berek Rosenthal, "The Relevance of Counselor Education for Elementary School Counselors," Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, VI, 2 (Dec., 1971), 76.

[72] "Vice-President's Message," Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, VI, 1 (Oct., 1971), 3.

Of all groups, counselors and directors of guidance share the most points of agreement. If, because of their position in relation to the counselor role, and because of their agreement, we can assume that they are most aware of the true guidance functions, then we must conclude that the other three groups in the study have a number of misconceptions which are preventing a definitive statement about elementary guidance. We can only speculate concerning the causes of such disagreement about counselor role. Certainly part of the cause must be a failure in communication between the guidance personnel in the State and other educators. Perhaps there is even a lack of communication among the guidance personnel themselves which prevents their recognition of their overall agreement on some major points. As Duane Brown states, "what is certain is that for any program to function efficiently there must be mutual agreement as to the functions to be performed by the various personnel within the program."[73] We might qualify this statement to read: there must be recognition of where there is agreement and attempt to solve disagreement in a rational and meaningful way. Since elementary counselors have rapidly increased in number in the past ten years, it is time for them to see themselves as a group different from other personnel in the guidance area and large and strong enough to effect necessary changes both in their education and in their certification requirements to make these more viable in terms of their actual role functions. Counselors, both elementary and secondary, are lumped together under certification laws established in 1956 -- sixteen years ago when elementary guidance was a novelty. Counselors and other groups involved in this study all stress the need for revision of certification laws. Some, particularly counselors themselves, point to the need to differentiate between secondary and elementary counselors in certification requirements. Others feel that certification as it now stands stresses teaching experience and occupational information, both of which are at best questionable. The problems posed by certification rules, as well as those related to counselor education and disagreement on counselor functions, lead to a number of recommendations.

---

[73] "Attitudes of School Personnel Toward the Teacher's Role in the Guidance Program," The Vocational Guidance Quarterly, XIV, 4 (Summer, 1966), p. 259.

Recommendations

The study of the dichotomy between the actual and the perceived role of the elementary counselor has revealed a number of problems within the whole area of elementary guidance counseling. These problems appear to be very deep-rooted and almost insurmountable in some cases. In fact, this study has tended to support the alarm of many working counselors about the position of the elementary counselor. We have, however, discovered one genuinely encouraging note--that the counselor role is seen as good and as valuable. If there is agreement on that, and this study shows that there is, the problems perhaps can be solved. But the time for change is now. Those of us who are counselors must begin to "really do those things we claim to be doing in our role statements" and we must "begin to stand up to those factors and factions in the educational process that we know are hurting our children each day. Only by effectively changing the environment can we be successful counselors."[74]

---

[74] Lamb, p. 3.

And we can only begin to change the environment by changing ourselves -- our preparation for our work and our emphasis and direction in that work -- and by changing the views others have of us. What we need, first of all, is a strong, state-wide organization of elementary school counselors, which will permit us to learn about ourselves, help us to disseminate accurate information about ourselves, our roles and our functions to other educators and to the public at large, enable us to promote relevant and realistic counselor education and certification, as well as to give us a political voice. Further, we need to become more actively involved in counselor preparation. This study points out that counselor educators are operating largely in a theoretical way and do not appear to have a realistic view of the role and role functions that the counselor performs. In order to effect change in counselor education, counselor educators must be encouraged to come into the schools, even if it is necessary to require that they serve an internship there in order to obtain their degrees, so that they will know what it means to be a working elementary counselor. It might, in fact, prove to be a very worthwhile experience for both the counselor and the counselor educator if they were to exchange positions for a Sabbatical year. Moreover, it seems to be the view of those people involved in this study that counselors should be trained as unique personnel, neither teachers nor psychologists nor administrators but a combination of these and other roles so that they should receive a broad background in education, guidance, psychology, testing, counseling and other courses to prepare him to carry out a variety of functions in relation, not only to the child, but to a number of school and outside groups. Such a broad preparation would require at least a master's degree in elementary counseling and such a degree should be required for certification of elementary counselors. In fact, if such a counselor education becomes a reality in all institutions of counselor education in the State, certification could be eliminated or made the responsibility of the degree-granting institution -- the State Board of Education sould simply act as a control of the higher institutions to ensure that proper programs were instituted and adhered to.

If, however, such a program of counselor training seems too drastic a change for the present at least, it is essential that the State revise the certification requirements and differentiate between secondary and elementary counselors. And it is further necessary that counselor education programs reassess their offerings in view of the actual operations within the schools.

As for the functioning of the counselor within the school, this study has shown that presently there is little emphasis on developmental aspects of guidance and as a result that the guidance programs in the elementary schools are not fulfilling the aims of education itself. Until every child is a part of the guidance program, guidance at that level will be at best a stop-gap measure. From the changing emphasis placed on such activities as "discussion with all children" and "home visits," it is apparent that counselors and other groups see the need for developmental guidance although they do not presently emphasize either of these functions. One problem could be the number of employed counselors. In a recent publication by the Massachusetts School Counselors Association, it is recommended that there be a minimum of one counselor for every 250 students.[75] The recommendation is for secondary schools; however, such a figure would be realistic for elementary schools as well, for it would allow the guidance program to reach every child and thereby enact all of its possible functions in remediation, prevention and development. Moreover, the guidance office would be able to have an open-door policy, thus encouraging children, parents and all groups to come to them, not just with problems but for encouragement, information or just communication. It would also enable the counselor to get into the home and thus provide liaison between the school and the home and eliminate the threat that schools present to many parents as well as forestall many problems arising out of home-school conflicts within children. Such an acceptance of guidance as an integral part of the educational system would ideally decrease the number of remedial tasks of the secondary school counselor and perhaps also of outside agencies. Such a dynamic role on the part of the counselor would eliminate the quandary in which he currently finds himself. He would and should be allowed great flexibility in establishing his daily routine, dependent upon both his own assessment of the needs of his school and community and on the educational philosophy of the area in which he works, but he should function within a framework of carefully designated and structured activities designed by a state-wide association of his peers.

---

[75] "*Secondary Schools Guidance Programs for the '70's: Roles and Functions*," (Massachusetts School Counselors Association, February, 1970, p. 29.

There are in the entire state of Massachusetts 351 cities and towns. There are 359 elementary guidance counselors in the State but few cities or towns have only one elementary counselor, thus many don't have even one. Some of the larger towns and cities have only one or two counselors who must handle several schools and hundreds of children. It is recommended that the effectiveness of the total elementary guidance program in the State be assessed by a study of those towns and cities which do not have elementary counselors as compared to those towns and cities that do and that consideration be given to the ratio of counselors to pupils for those towns that have such personnel. A second study which is also recommended is to investigate the difference between the roles and role functions of elementary and secondary counseling. Such a study would offer evidence relative to counselor education and certification.

Such studies are important to the fate of elementary guidance not only in this state but in the nation. A clearer understanding of the elementary counselor's role, which this study has tried to gain, is essential for the future of guidance and its impact upon the schools. If the aims of guidance are those of education -- to develop the whole child, every child, most positively in all aspects of his being -- then guidance must survive and to do so it must become a coherent, dynamic force in the schools. Only by being such a force can it help the schools to give to the world responsible, happy, total human beings who can create a world in which we would all like to live.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Apostal, Robert A. "Objectives of Elementary Guidance." *The School Counselor*, X, 1 (October, 1962), 23-26.

Arkin, Herbert and Raymond R. Colton. *Statistical Methods*. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1956.

Barnes, Keith and Patricia McClure. "Elementary Guidance -- A Critical Look from the Field." *Elementary School Guidance and Counseling*, IV, 2 (December, 1969), 104-111.

Bencher, Don. "Counseling, Consulting or Developmental Guidance? Toward An Answer." *Elementary School Guidance and Counseling*, IV, 4 (May, 1970), 245-252.

Best, John W. *Research in Education*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959.

Biasco, Frank. "Impressions of an Observor." *Elementary School Guidance and Counseling*, III, 4 (May, 1969), 242-249.

Boy, Angelo V. "Educational and Counseling Goals." *Elementary School Guidance and Counseling*, III, 2 (December, 1968), 84-89.

Boyd, William. *The History of Western Education*. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1952.

Brown, Duane. "Attitudes of School Personnel Toward the Teacher's Role in the Guidance Program." *The Vocational Guidance Quarterly*, XIV, 4 (Summer, 1966), 254-262.

Carlson, Jon and John J. Pietrofesa. "A Trilevel Guidance Structure: An Answer to Our Apparent Ineffectiveness." *Elementary School Guidance and Counseling*, V, 3 (March, 1970), 191-195.

Dewey, John. *Dictionary of Education*, ed. Ralph B. Winn. New York: Philosophical Library, 1959.

Dinkmeyer, Don C. *Guidance and Counseling in the Elementary School*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968.

Dunlop, Richard. "The Counselor Educator, Psychologist or Something Unique?" *Focus on Guidance*, III, 9 (May, 1971), 1-3.

Eckerson, Louise O. "In Support of a Loosely Defined Role for the Elementary School Counselor." *Elementary School Guidance and Counseling*, IV, 2 (December, 1969), 82-86.

Elementary Guidance in Iowa: A Guide. Iowa: Department of Public Instruction, n.d.

Faust, Verne. *Establishing Guidance Programs in Elementary Schools*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1960.

Fulton, Reed. "Questions in Our Minds About Guidance." *The Clearing House*, XXVIII, 7 (March, 1954), 394-397.

Gage, N. L., ed. Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand, McNally and Company, 1963.

Gibson, Robert L. and Robert E. Higgins. Techniques of Guidance: An Approach to Pupil Analysis. Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1966.

Guidance of Children in Elementary Schools. New York: Board of Education of the City of New York, 1956.

Hansen, James C. and Richard R. Stevie. Elementary School Guidance. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1969.

Hart, Darrell H. and Ronald J. Prince. "Role Conflict for School Counselors: Training Versus Job Demands." The Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXXIII, 5 (January, 1970), 374-379.

Hatch, Raymond N. and James W. Costar. Guidance Services in the Elementary School. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown, Company, 1961.

Hennessy, Thomas C., ed. The Interdisciplinary Roots of Guidance. New York: Fordham University Press, 1966.

Herbart, Johann. Outlines of Educational Doctrine, Trans., A. F. Lange. New York, n.p., 1901.

Hill, George. "Doctoral Preparation in the Field of Elementary School Guidance. Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, IV, 3 (March, 1969), 197-202.

______________. "The Emerging Role of Guidance in the Elementary Schools." Proceedings of the New England Guidance Conference, November, 1963.

Hutson, Percival W. Guidance Functions in Education. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1958.

Isenberg, Robert L. "From Your Vice-President." Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, IV, 4 (May, 1970), 243.

__________. "Vice-President's Message." Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, V, 4 (May, 1971), 245-246.

Jahoda, Marie and Neil Warren. Attitudes. Baltimore, Maryland: Penquin Books, 1966.

Koplitz, Eugene D., ed. Guidance in the Elementary Schools: Theory, Research and Practice. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown, Co., 1968.

Kowitz, Gerald T. and Norma G. Kowitz. Guidance in the Elementary Classroom. New York: McGraw Hill, Inc., 1959.

Lamb, Jackie, "Vice-President's Message." Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, VI, 1 (October, 1971), 3.

Landy, Edward and Arthur M. Kroll, eds. Guidance in American Education II: Current Issues and Suggested Action. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1965.

__________. Guidance in American Education III: Needs & Influencing Forces. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Graduate School of Education, 1966.

_____________________.and John C. Palmer. Guidance in the Public Schools. Boston, Mass.: Council for Public Schools, n.d.

Liddle, Gordon P. and Arthur M. Kroll. Pupil Services for Massachusetts Schools. Boston, Mass.: Advisory Council on Education, 1969.

Locke, John. Some Thoughts Concerning Education. Cambridge, England: R. H. Quick, 1880.

Lytton, Hugh. School Counselling and Counsellor Education in the United States. Great Britain: St. Ann's Press, 1968.

Magary, James F. School Psychological Services. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1957.

Martinson, Ruth and Harry Smallenburg. Guidance in Elementary Schools. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1958.

Massachusetts School Counselors Association. Secondary Schools Guidance Program for the '70's: Roles and Functions. February, 1971.

McDougall, William P. and Henry M. Reitan. "The Elementary Counselor as Perceived by Elementary Principals." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXXII, 4 (Dec., 1963), 348-358.

Meeks, Anna R. Guidance in Elementary Education. New York: The Ronald Press, 1968.

Moore, John and Margaret Haley. "Relevancy in the Training of Elementary School Counselors." Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, V, 4 (May, 1971), 308-315.

Moreau, George H., ed. Guidance Awareness in Elementary Education. Washington, D. C,: National Catholic Educational Association, 1967.

Mortensen, Donald G. and Allen M. Schmuller. Guidance in Today's Schools. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1959.

Mosher, Ralph L., and Richard F. Carle and Chris D. Kehas. Guidance: An Examination. New York: Harcort, Brace & World, 1965.

Netzchke and Hill. "The Professionalization of the Elementary School Counselor." Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, IV, 2 (December, 1969), 87-94.

Ogden, C. K. and I. A. Richards. The Meaning of Meaning. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1956.

Osgood, Charles E., et al. The Measurement of Meaning. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1971.

Pelegreno, Dominick D. "The Elementary School Counselor and The Affective Domain." Elementary School Guidance and Counseling. IV, 4 (May, 1970), 350-351.

Phillips, Wallace. "The Professionalization of Elementary School Counselors." Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, IV, 2 (December, 1969), 87-94.

Pompian, Sue. "Elementary School Counseling Preparation in the Midwest. "*Elementary School Guidance and Counseling*, III, 4 (May, 1969), 299-300.

Report of the ASCA-ACES Joint Committee on the Elementary School Counselor. Washington, D. C.: American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1966.

Requirements for Certification. Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Department of Education, Bureau of Teacher Certification and Placement, 1956.

Rosenthal, Sylvia Berek. "The Relevance of Counselor Education for Elementary School Counselors." *Elementary School Guidance and Counseling*, VI, 2 (December, 1971), 76-80.

Siegel, Sidney, *Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences*. New York: McGraw-Hill Company, Inc., 1956.

Smith, Hyrum M. and Louise O. Eckerson. *Guidance for Children in Elementary Schools*. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1963.

____________________. *Guidance Services in Elementary Schools*. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Snider, James G. and Charles E. Osgood. *Semantic Differential Technique*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1969.

Stiller, Alfred. *School Counseling: A View From Within*. Washington, D. C.: American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1967.

Thorndike, Robert L. and Elizabeth Hagen. Measurement and Evaluation in Psychology and Education. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1961.

Tyler, Leona E. Tests and Measurements. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.

____________________. The Work of the Counselor. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1961.

Van Hoose, William H., Mildred Peters and George E. Leonard. The Elementary School Counselor. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1967.

Van Hoose, William H. and Catherine M. Vafakas. "Status of Guidance and Counseling in the Elementary Schools." Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXVI, 6 (Feb., 1968), 536-539.

Vigneault, Leo. "The Elementary School Counselor as a Guidance Counselor" (unpublished speech). APGA Convention, Detroit, Michigan, 1968.

Willey, Roy D. Guidance in Elementary Education. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1952.

Williams, J. Bradley. Elementary Counseling and Guidance Handbook. Denver, Colorado: Department of Education, 1970.

APPENDIX A

STANDARD DEVIATION TABLE

	Coun.	Prin.	Dir.	Supt.	Educ.
Child What Is	.793	.361	.678	.735	.787
Child What Should Be	.748	.374	1.217	.812	.872
Parent What Is	1.600	1.330	1.072	.793	.412
Parent What Should Be	.598	.520	.616	.600	1.276
Teacher What Is	.648	1.562	.556	.174	.332
Teacher What Should Be	.655	.608	.714	.656	.510
Administration What Is	.663	.520	.683	.656	.480
Administration What Should Be	1.216	.663	.770	.854	1.050
Outside Agencies & Community What Is	.566	.424	.634	.374	.721
Outside Agencies & Community What Should Be	.500	.831	.337	.100	.436

APPENDIX B

2 Harwood Drive
Bernardston, Mass.
01337
October 1, 1971

Dear Educator:

In 1970 Robert Isenberg, the Vice-President of the American School Counselors Association, wrote that he would like to see a survey showing where elementary counselors are in each state, "what they are doing, what they think they should be doing, and what education, training and experience is demanded of them by their states." This has also been a major concern of the Massachusetts School Counselors Association, particularly in the elementary school guidance division, as I personally discovered when I was a member of the Advisory Board for that group. Because of my interest in and concern about this whole problem, I have undertaken a study of elementary guidance in the state of Massachusetts as my doctoral problem.

The enclosed questionnaire is being distributed to elementary school counselors, guidance directors or directors of pupil personnel services, elementary school principals, superintendents of schools and college counselor educators. The intent is to analyze the perceived and the actual role of the elementary guidance counselor in this State, in order to discover areas of agreement and disagreemett among them, the relevance and adequacy of elementary school counselor preparation and needs for improvement. It is my intention to use the findings not only for personal educational goals but also to disseminate them through publication in order to effect necessary changes.

Instructions for each part of the questionnaire are given at the beginning of each section. The forms are anonymous; self-addressed, stamped envelopes are enclosed. I would appreciate very much your taking the 15 minutes or so required to complete the form and returning it to me by October 15.

Yours for better counseling,

Frederick E. Ellis
Director of Pupil Personnel
Services
Ware, Massachusetts

October 17, 1971

Dear Educator:

On October 2 I mailed a questionnaire to you concerning the role of the elementary guidance counselor. Because of a problem with the third class mailing (some postal centers held the mailing three weeks or more!), many of you may have received your questionnaire only in the past day or two. Some of you may not have received it yet.

Because of the great expense this study entails, I must extend the return date to November 1 so that all of you will have a chance to return yours to me. In the event that there are still some questionnaires unreturned on November 1, I will remail questionnaires to those who have not replied.

I would greatly appreciate your cooperation, not only for the sake of my study but for what I hope will be improved counseling in the state of Massachusetts. If you have already returned your questionnaire, thanks very much.

Yours very truly,

Frederick E. Ellis

November 4, 1971

Dear Principal:

Of the 1099 elementary school principals in Massachusetts, only 99 recently received a questionnaire on guidance counselors from me. You were one of these. Twenty-two of these 99 principals returned their completed questionnaires to me. You were not one of these. Perhaps your failure to return the questionnaire was due to an oversight. I hope so, for the inadequacy of the returns threatens the validity of my study.

If you could take only ten or fifteen minutes from your busy schedule to fill out the questionnaire and return it, it would certainly help me to complete a valid study of elementary guidance in the state. If you have discarded the questionnaire, I would be more than happy to send you another upon request.

Would you please help me to reach a 75% response from principals?

Sincerely,

Frederick E. Ellis
2 Harwood Drive
Bernardston, Mass. 01301

2 Harwood Drive
Bernardston, Mass.
01301
November 15, 1971

Dear Educator:

Questionnaires have been coming in regularly and the percent of returns is growing rapidly. Some of you still have not returned yours, however. In the hope that you are willing to participate in the study of the elementary school counselor but have mislaid or forgotten the questionnaire, I am enclosing another copy and a return envelope for your use.

I hope that you will join your peers in responding to my request, for I'm sure you'll agree that the study of the elementary counselor in this State is a much-needed one. Your views are important. Won't you complete the questionnaire and return it to me so that those views will be reflected in the study?

Since I must ask for all returns by December 1 so that analysis can begin then, I'd appreciate it if you could take some time in the next day or two to fill out the enclosed questionnaire and get it in the mail.

Sincerely,

Frederick E. Ellis

Title of present position

Type of system: urban
surburan, rural

A Study of the Elementary School Guidance Counselor in the State of Massachusetts

Part I. The role of the elementary school guidance counselor is divided below into 5 categories. In each category you are asked to indicate both the degree of importance presently assigned to a role in your school and the degree of importance assigned to it in an ideal guidance program. Indicate your answer by circling the number which indicates the degree of importance you ascribe to the role.

1. not important 2. slightly important 3. moderately important

4. very important 5. essential

Example: Guidance counselors should belong to 5 professional organizations.

what is	what should be
1 2 [✓ 3] 4 5	1 [✓ 2] 3 4 5

A. Roles pertaining to the child

What is		What should be
1 2 3 4 5	a) Discussions with all children	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	b) Counseling only referrals	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	c) Counseling only individually	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	d) Counseling only in groups	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	e) Counseling individuals & groups	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	f) Teach subject matter of guidance	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	g) Administering full testing program	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	h) Interpreting test results	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	i) Identifying special students	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	j) Providing career information	1 2 3 4 5

B. Roles pertaining to the parent

what is			what should be
1 2 3 4 5	a)	Home visits	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	b)	Consultations in school	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	c)	Interpret test results	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	d)	Act as liaison with school personnel	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	e)	Recommend outside agencies	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	f)	Individual counseling	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	g)	Conduct group counseling	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	h)	Provide educational information	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	i)	Provide occupational information	1 2 3 4 5

C. Roles pertaining to the teacher

What is			what should be
1 2 3 4 5	a)	Assist in group testing	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	b)	Assist in discipline	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	c)	Interpret test results	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	d)	Provide information on child	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	e)	Provide in-service training	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	f)	Encourage counseling of teachers	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	g)	Assist in parent-teacher conferences	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	h)	Provide crisis intervention	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	i)	Suggest alternate methods for relating to individuals	1 2 3 4 5

D. Roles pertaining to administration

What is		What should be
1 2 3 4 5	a) Maintain central record file	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	b) Substitute when needed	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	c) Recommend group or grade placement	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	d) Help in scheduling	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	e) Participate in workshops	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	f) Provide reports of counselor activities	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	g) Write federal projects	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	h) Provide statistical analysis on achievement test results	1 2 3 4 5

E. Roles pertaining to outside agencies and community

what is		what should be
1 2 3 4 5	a) Refer children for special services	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	b) Provide information to outside agencies upon request	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	c) Do follow-up studies	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	d) Help school in public relations	1 2 3 4 5
1 2 3 4 5	e) Act as liaison for parents to outside agencies	1 2 3 4 5

Part II. The education, training and certification of the elementary guidance counselor is the subject of Part II. Indicate on the scale, 1 - 5, your response to each phrase below by circling the number which corresponds to the degree of importance you attach to it.

1. not important
2. slightly important
3. moderately important
4. very important
5. essential

Example: All guidance counselors should have training in football.

[✓ 1] 2 3 4 5

a)	Revision of State certification requirements	1	2	3	4	5
b)	Elimination of State certification requirements	1	2	3	4	5
c)	Broad liberal arts education	1	2	3	4	5
d)	Broad behavioral science education	1	2	3	4	5
e)	Strong elementary education preparation	1	2	3	4	5
f)	Strong psychology background	1	2	3	4	5
g)	Strong guidance background	1	2	3	4	5
h)	Knowledge of research and statistics	1	2	3	4	5
i)	Educational preparation for parent counseling	1	2	3	4	5
j)	Experience in classroom teaching	1	2	3	4	5
k)	Internship in elementary guidance	1	2	3	4	5
l)	Psychometric training	1	2	3	4	5
m)	Flexibility in determining functions	1	2	3	4	5
n)	Membership in area and state counselor organizations	1	2	3	4	5
o)	Master's degree minimum	1	2	3	4	5
p)	Participation in professional improvement activities	1	2	3	4	5

q) List below the courses you feel should be required for elementary counselor preparation:

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

r) List any important changes you feel should be made in State certification laws in Massachusetts:

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

s) List in rank order what you consider the necessary functions of the elementary guidance counselor:

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

Part III. On the following questionnaire indicate your perception of the role of the school person indicated by placing a cross in the space on the 7-space scale which indicates your response to the words at the opposite ends of the scale.

Example: College professors are

Poor ___:___:_x_:___:___:___:___:rich

A. Elementary school principals are:

1. unpleasant ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ pleasant

2. strong ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ weak

3. active ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ passive

4. honest ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ dishonest

5. tense ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ relaxed

6. clean ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ dirty

7. kind ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ cruel

8. friendly ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ unfriendly

9. bad ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ good

10. simple ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ complex

11. awful ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ nice

12. important ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ unimportant

13. aggressive ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ defensive
14. worthless ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ valuable
15. soft ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ hard
16. fair ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ unfair

B. Elementary school guidance counselors are:

1. unpleasant ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ pleasant
2. strong ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ weak
3. active ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ passive
4. honest ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ dishonest
5. tense ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ relaxed
6. clean ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ dirty
7. kind ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ cruel
8. friendly ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ unfriendly
9. bad ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ good
10. simple ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ complex
11. awful ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ nice
12. important ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ unimportant
13. aggressive ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ defensive
14. worthless ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ valuable
15. soft ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ hard
16. fair ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ unfair